DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER W., Ph.D. Cross Purposes: U.S. Missionaries and the U.S. Occupation of Haiti. (2019)
Directed by Dr. Mark Elliott. 252 pp.

The purpose of this dissertation is to explore the previously understudied role of U.S. missionaries in the intervention and occupation of the Republic of Haiti by the United States from 1915 to 1934. The prior historiography for the U.S. occupation of Haiti has focused on the Wilson administration in its decision to intervene in the beleaguered Caribbean republic, as well as how the subsequent occupation created animosity toward U.S. control after it diminished native sovereignty and reportedly committed abuses against the Haitian population. Important to our understanding of those events is the 1921 U.S. Senate hearings investigating the rationale given for U.S. intervention in Haiti and reports of misconduct by U.S. soldiers against the Haitians. However, how U.S. Protestant missionaries in Haiti influenced and impacted these hearings, and the occupation overall, has not been studied up to this point. This study demonstrates that U.S. Protestant missionaries working in Haiti first appealed to the U.S. government to assist an increasingly unstable Haiti, and later became outspoken opponents to the U.S. occupation once they concluded it was increasing the suffering of the Haitian people. These missionaries are shown to have influenced both political decision-making regarding U.S. policy towards Haiti and U.S. public opinion regarding the occupation.

This study focuses on two U.S. missionaries who were shown in U.S. government documents, NAACP articles, and U.S. newspaper reports to be the most active in trying to first reform, then encourage the withdrawal of the U.S. forces from Haiti: L. Ton

Evans from the American Baptist denomination and S.E. Churchstone Lord of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. Whereas Evans's activities focused on bringing political attention to the abuses of the Haitians by the occupying forces, first to the Wilson administration and then to Wilson's Republican opponents, Lord focused his efforts on informing the NAACP and the African American community of these abuses. Both missionaries are shown to have influenced the U.S. press in shifting public opinion of the occupation from supportive to critical. Their actions resulted in the U.S. government under the Harding administration curtailing abuses against the Haitian people and diminishing political and public support for the occupation until its end in 1934. This adds greater complexity to the existing historiography of both U.S./Wilsonian policy towards the Caribbean and Latin American in the early twentieth century, which has traditionally viewed U.S. missionaries there at that time as agents of U.S. imperialism. A brief comparison with the parallel U.S. occupations of the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua during that same period also reveals that this role of U.S. Protestant missionaries challenging their home government's occupational policy in the region was unique to Haiti.

CROSS PURPOSES: U.S. MISSIONARIES AND THE U.S. OCCUPATION OF HAITI

by

Christopher W. Davis

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2019

Approved by

_____
Committee Chair

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation written by Christopher W. Davis has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair

Mark E. Elliott

Committee Members

W. Greg O'Brien

Linda M. Rupert

Peter B. Villella

_____
Date of Acceptance by Committee

_____
Date of Final Oral Examination

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

On July 28, 1915, the *U.S.S. Washington*, under the command of Admiral William Caperton, sailed into the bay outside of the Haitian capital of Port-au-Prince. Under orders from U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, 330 American Marines disembarked from the *Washington* and swiftly took control of the Haitian Government, meeting almost no resistance in the process. Shortly after taking control of the Republic of Haiti, the United States began a military occupation of that nation which continued for 19 years. What prompted the United States to engage in and maintain military action in Haiti from 1915 to 1934 is a complex story with multiple individuals, groups, and organizations contributing to these events. This study explores the role of individuals within a particular group of Americans whose influence on, and interaction with, U.S. foreign policy in the early twentieth century has seldom been explored in general and barely at all in regard to Haiti. The invasion and subsequent occupation are thus far only understood via political and economic lenses, and therefore the main actors through which this story has traditionally been told are either U.S. politicians or businessmen. Therefore, the intervention itself has been explored largely within the limited scope of strategic or economic gain for the United States, with religious, moral, and humanitarian motivations

only having been explored regarding the person of Woodrow Wilson. The goal of this study is to demonstrate the significant and thus far understudied role of religious, non-state actors on the U.S. occupation of Haiti.

The title "cross purposes" signifies the two stages in which U.S. Protestant missionary involvement in the intervention and occupation of Haiti interacted with U.S. President Woodrow Wilson's leadership in those events. The "cross purposes" of the intervention stage speaks of how both the Protestant missionaries and President Wilson viewed themselves as agents of Christian principles to bring order and prosperity to Haiti. Wilsonian biographer, Arthur S. Link, describes Wilson and his first Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan, as being motivated in Haiti and elsewhere in the U.S. sphere of influence to advance the cause of international peace through the principles of democracy and Protestant Christianity.[1] At this stage, Wilson saw himself as a kind of missionary, which initially gave U.S. missionaries to Haiti confidence that their goals for the Haitian people were well aligned with that of the U.S government. As the intervention stage gave way to the occupation, however, U.S. missionaries and the Wilson administration found themselves at a different kind of "cross purposes". By 1918, U.S. missionaries to Haiti became painfully aware that their goals for Haiti, and that of the U.S. government and military, were not in alignment after all.

The evidence for U.S. Protestant missionaries having had a significant role in shaping and ending the U.S. occupation of Haiti is found in this divergence. This study

[1] Arthur S. Link, *Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era, 1910-1917* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1954), 82.

shows that, initially, U.S. Protestant missionaries in Haiti were optimistic, either whole-heartedly or cautiously so, of Wilson's intentions to militarily intervene in Haiti. This is consistent with Richard Gamble's analysis of Progressive Protestant Christianity in the pre-WWI United States, in which many U.S. Protestants felt the election of Wilson in 1913 had given them a political ally in promoting a social gospel of bringing peace and order to the world.[2] While there seemed to be reason for U.S. missionaries in Haiti to be hopeful for Wilson's internationalist philosophy, there were significant differences between Wilson the missionary and the actual missionaries on the ground. Link described Wilson and Bryan's foreign policy between 1913 and 1914 as "missionary diplomacy" yet clarifies this as not referring to the protection of U.S. missionaries and churches abroad but rather to advance democracy and international peace.[3] Wilson and Bryan are thus portrayed as missionaries of democracy, and therefore interventions in places like Haiti could be, and were in their minds, justified as they believed it was the mission of the United States to bring democracy to those they viewed as incapable of bringing it to themselves.[4]

Though Wilson is not the focus of this study, how U.S missionaries in Haiti reacted and eventually challenged his belief that the United States was justified to intervene, militarily if necessary, to achieve ordered and stable democracy in the neighboring republic is. Gamble and Link both describe Woodrow Wilson as a leader

[2] Richard M. Gamble, *The War for Righteousness: Progressive Christianity, the Great War, and the Rise of the Messianic Nation* (Wilmington: ISI Books, 2003), 98.
[3] Link, *Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era*, 82.
[4] Arthur S. Link, *Wilson: The New Freedom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956), 278. Link, *Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era*, 94.

whose religious ideology motivated his decisions on foreign policy, however, John Cooper's comparative biography of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson describes Wilson as more nuanced in this regard. Cooper describes Wilson as a devout Protestant but, while holding strong views about personal and social morality, also demonstrated little patience for the "vice crusades" that were prevalent at the time.[5] Without trying to measure Wilson's religiosity, if indeed it is even possible to measure such, his justification for the invasion of Haiti found support among U.S. missionaries there in 1915. As intervention turned into occupation, however, that support waned. Link describes the duality of Woodrow Wilson as being a staunch non-interventionist and supporter of equality of all nations who in turn used violent means to impose the U.S.'s will via occupation and control on nations that were already technically democracies.[6] The goal of this study is to reveal the extent to which U.S. missionaries worked against this duality of the part of Wilson once it became evident to them.

The historiography on the invasion and occupation of Haiti itself is fairly limited, with much of it focusing more on the nineteen-year occupation than on the factors and forces that led to it. While scholars have written much concerning U.S. foreign policy in the early twentieth century, and on Wilsonian foreign policy in particular, there are only a few works on U.S. policy towards Haiti during this time specifically. The most comprehensive works on the topic include Hans Schmidt's *The United States Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934*, Mary Renda's *Taking Haiti: Military Occupation & the Culture of*

[5] John Milton Cooper, Jr., *The Warrior and the Priest: Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 1983), 19.
[6] Arthur S. Link, *Wilson: The Struggle for Neutrality* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), 495.

U.S. Imperialism, 1915-1941, and Jeffrey Sommers's *Race, Reality, and Realpolitik: U.S.-Haiti Relations in the Lead Up to the 1915 Occupation.*[7] With the exception of Sommers's book, these works focus their attention on the occupation rather than on the intervention, with Schmidt providing a more narrative history and Renda focusing more on how U.S. culture influenced the character of the occupation. Beyond these three works, the remaining historiography is limited to chapters within books on general Haitian history such as Laurent Dubois's *Haiti: The Aftershocks of History*, Phillipe Girard's *Haiti: The Tumultuous History – From Pearl of the Caribbean to Broken Nation*, and David Nicholls' *From Dessalines to Duvalier: Race, Colour and National Independence in Haiti.*[8]

This historiography is important to consider because it establishes the significance of the U.S. occupation in American and Haitian history, while also exploring the themes that characterized U.S. policy and administration over Haiti during that period. As is well described in Renda's work, both racial prejudice and paternalism figure heavily in how the U.S. administered Haiti and justified its presence there. What the historiography currently does not provide is a perspective of the need for, and execution of, the invasion and occupation outside of the U.S. government or military. These perspectives are vital to

[7] Mary Renda, *Taking Haiti: Military Occupation & the Culture of U.S. Imperialism, 1915-1940* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001). Hans Schmidt, *The United States Occupation Haiti: 1915-1934*. 2nd Printing (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1995). Jeffrey Sommers, *Race, Reality, and Realpolitik: U.S.-Haiti Relations in the Lead Up to the 1915 Occupation* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2015).

[8] Laurent Dubois, *Haiti: The Aftershocks of History* (New York: Picador, 2012). Philippe Girard, *Haiti: The Tumultuous History – From Pearl of the Caribbean to Broken Nation* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010). David Nicholls, *From Dessalines to Duvalier: Race, Colour, and National Independence in Haiti* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1996).

our understanding of these events, however, there is an opportunity here to further our understanding of these events by focusing on U.S. Protestant missionaries who played a role in both advocating U.S. intervention in Haiti and protesting against it once they concluded that the well-being of the Haitian people was negatively being impacted by the occupation. U.S. missionaries operating in Haiti before and after 1915 offer a perspective that differs from that of either the state or the military and their role in these events deserves further exploration.

If the historiography on the invasion and occupation itself is scant, any analysis of the role of U.S. missionaries in Haiti during these events is all but non-existent. In 1993 Scott H. Olsen highlighted this gap in the existing scholarship as a significant flaw in how the history of U.S. foreign policy has been studied. He has made the case that, because U.S. missionaries have often served as the first point of contact between Americans and the peoples of developing nations, their absence in the study of early twentieth century foreign policy misses an opportunity to better understand the role of religion in political policies abroad.[9] Some work has been done in general missionary history in the developing world, such as Ian Tyrrell's *Reforming the World: The Creation of America's Moral Empire* and Holger Bernt Hansen and Michael Twaddle's *Christian Missionaries & The State in the Third World.*[10] There is also a wide body of literature for the role religion played in the expansion of the British and French empires of the

[9] Scott H. Olsen, "Reverend L. Ton Evans and The United States Occupation of Haiti," *Caribbean Studies*, Vol. 26, No. ½ (1993), 23.
[10] Holger Bernt Hansen & Michael Twaddle, *Christian Missionaries & The State in the Third World* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2002). Ian Tyrrell, *Reforming the World: The Creation of America's Moral Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).

nineteenth century. However, in the case of Haiti in and around the time of the U.S. invasion and occupation, Olsen's call for a synthesis of missionary and American foreign policy history has remained unanswered, nor has he pursued further exploration of missionaries in Haiti. This work aims to address that gap in the research.

Olsen's call was part of an article exploring the role of one particular missionary to Haiti pre- and post-invasion: Reverend L. Ton Evans. Renda makes reference to Evans, as well as AME missionary S.E. Churchstone Lord, but only briefly as the U.S. military during the occupation is her primary focus. Originally born in Wales before immigrating to the U.S., Evans became the pioneer U.S. Baptist missionary to Haiti in 1906 and was given the task by the National Baptist Convention of preparing full-scale mission operations there. Though himself being white, his work on behalf of the Haitian people gained him the financial support of the Lott Carey Mission Board; an African-American Baptist organization who sponsored Evans's work in Haiti after the beginning of the U.S. occupation. Written as a biographical narrative, Olsen's article briefly tells the story of how Rev. Evans had been a proponent of U.S. intervention prior to the occupation and had over time, not only became critical of military abuses of the local population but became a key witness against the occupation during the 1921 U.S. Senate hearings. Olsen presents this story as an example of why missionaries as non-state actors need further consideration in the historical narrative of events such as the US intervention in Haiti. However, the story he tells is both brief and solitary as there are to date no other focused historical studies of either Reverend Evans or any other U.S. missionary to Haiti

during that time. Evans, though a significant figure during these events, remains little more than footnote.

Much of the information that is available concerning Reverend Evans originates from the testimony he provided during the 1921 Senate hearings regarding the U.S. occupation. Having become an outspoken critic of the occupation, due in large part to several instances of abuse against the local population by Marines stationed in Haiti, these hearings provided an outlet and an opportunity for Evans to bring public and political attention to these issues. Having been critical of Wilson's interventionist foreign policy in Latin America and the Caribbean during the presidential campaign, President Warren G. Harding's call to investigate the ongoing occupation provided Evans the forum he needed. This study will highlight the role that Evans as a missionary in Haiti played in influencing U.S. government policy towards Haiti before and during the occupation, as well as how that role changed as the occupation continued.

While Rev. Evans deserves further exploration in his role in the pre- and post-invasion U.S. policy towards Haiti, further exploration is also needed for understanding the role of African-American missionaries such as S.E. Churchstone Lord in shaping public opinion over these events. S. E. Churchstone Lord was a missionary working on behalf of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in Haiti during the early years of the American occupation. Like Evans, he played a significant role in shaping public opinion against the occupation by bringing the conditions of the Haitian people under U.S. military rule to light. A significant difference between them is that, while Evans appealed to the U.S. government to investigate and reform its administration in Haiti, Lord worked

to make the African-American community aware of the racist and paternalistic treatment of the Haitian population by the U.S. forces stationed there. Lord acted as the eyes and ears of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in Haiti during the occupation and sent correspondence of reports on the Haitian situation to W.E.B Dubois that were included in publications of the official magazine of the NAACP, *The Crisis*. Lord, like Evans, deserves greater exploration in his role in turning the tide of public opinion, especially in the African-American community of the time, against the occupation. Furthermore, greater exploration of Lord's role is all the more necessary as he has at this point received even less historiographical attention than Evans.

Missionaries provide a novel case study of how religion and foreign policy overlapped in both the invasion and occupation of Haiti. So far, these events have been understood solely from the perspective of the U.S. government, businessmen, and soldiers who were stationed in Haiti. These groups, each of whom either pushed for U.S. intervention or were responsible for carrying it out, are described in the historiography as being primarily motivated by national security and/or economic interests. President Wilson's speeches justifying the intervention also listed moral concerns about allowing a neighboring country to struggle through chronic instability, but these concerns would always be tethered to concerns over U.S. national interests. Missionaries, on the other hand, serve as a group whose moral impetus to engage the Haitian population, as we shall see in the examples of Evans and Lord, was not so tethered to concerns over U.S. national security. Though political figures such as Wilson were at least in part motivated by religious belief, the religious motivations of these two missionaries to Haiti, based on

how they applied those beliefs during the occupation, had greater independence from, and at times conflicted with, the sort of religious nationalism of Wilson's worldview. How the goals of U.S. missionaries and the Wilson Administration, as well as the individual missionaries and their mission boards, converged and diverged will be a key point in understanding the relationship between them.

Rev. Evans provides a fascinating case study as the Senate hearing revealed that he was initially in favor of the intervention due to the chronic political instability in Haiti, which he attributed to, among other factors, German interference. This stands as a prime example of how a missionary and the Wilson Administration, for different reasons, found themselves of like mind in believing that action needed to be taken against increased German activity in Haiti. The differences in the motivating desire for U.S. intervention in Haiti became more apparent between Evans and Wilson as the German threat passed and the character of the occupation showed far greater concern for U.S. interests rather than the spiritual and physical wellbeing of the Haitian people. A major shift in how Evans perceived his role in Haiti occurred in 1918 as, unlike Lord and the African Methodist Episcopal Church who initially regarded U.S. intentions towards Haiti as dubious at best, he went from being enthusiastic to critical of U.S. intervention in Haiti after that point in time.

Due to the large variety of Christian denominations who possessed a focus on international missions at the time, this work limits its focus to the Protestant denominations that were most active in Haiti during the period of U.S. intervention and occupation, as well as the most vocal in their views concerning U.S. policy in Haiti. The

prevailing Protestant denominations with active missions specific to Haiti during this time were the American Baptist Foreign Mission Board and the African Methodist Episcopal Church (AME). The selection of these two denominations as the focus of this work is also based on the potential for both the AME mission activities and Rev. Evans' sponsorship by the African-American Baptist Lott Carey Foundation to provide an opportunity to see the intersection of Protestant religious and racial uplift activities that connected the United States and Haiti. Additionally, how the individual missionaries themselves interacted with their mutual denominational institutions is of interest to this study as the goals of the missionaries themselves and their institutions during these events were not always in agreement.

When discussing the U.S. occupation of Haiti, as well as much of Haitian history, the initial hope of this project was to bring in more of the Haitian perspective of these events than the previous historiography has produced. As the scope of this project became more narrowed to focus solely on the missionaries themselves, it also became unnecessary at this stage to incorporate those voices. Significant challenges such as widespread illiteracy, a cultural tendency among rural Haitians to put greater trust in oral history rather than written history, and records destroyed or threatened by political and natural disasters, made it difficult to retrieve reactions to the U.S. occupation in Haitian words. Haitian grievances from Haitians themselves are limited to political leaders and authors such as Jean Price-Mars. Renda's *Taking Haiti* attempts to reclaim some of what the Haitians experienced based on reports and diaries of the Marines stationed in Haiti during the occupation, and, while this does add much to our understanding of these

events, it still only provides the Haitian situation through the eyes of those tasked with carrying out American, not Haitian, interests. U.S. missionaries, while still only offering the Haitian reaction through an American lens, can at least provide a similar if parallel contribution with a different and previously unexplored perspective of those whose motives for attempting to speak for the Haitian people were neither strategic nor political in nature. Their motivations for being in Haiti were both spiritual and humanitarian and included racial uplift for people of African descent as a stated objective. Whereas the soldiers by their profession were expected to act on behalf of the interests of the United States, missionaries, though American in their nationality, were motivated by what they at least viewed as the needs of the Haitian people. Their perception of what grievances the Haitians had against the U.S. occupation, which they believed fervently enough to appeal to and protest against their home government, gives us a different perspective of these events even if the Haitian voices are admittedly still being carried through American filters.

Therefore, the variety of source material collected for this project is still limited to these U.S. filters. The collected source material for the evidence presented in the following chapters consists of U.S. government documents (largely from the Senate hearings and the U.S. State Department), U.S. abolitionist writings about Haiti's significance, Baptist and AME organizational accounts, NAACP articles, and various U.S. newspaper articles. What these varied sources have in common is that all of these are written from the perspectives of Americans who, while having first- or second-hand interaction with Haitians, still admittedly does not include direct Haitian voices. While

the focus of this study at this stage remained on recovering the impact of U.S. missionaries on shaping and eventually ending the U.S. occupation of Haiti, and the collected evidence served that narrowed purpose, the addition of Haitian source material remains a goal for expanding future research in this area.

The issue of race is inexorably intertwined with the history of American-Haitian relations, the motivations and methods of the intervention and occupation, and in U.S. missionary activities in Haiti, and so the factor of race will be a prominent feature throughout this work. During the nineteenth century the example of the Haitian Republic was used by both abolitionists and slaveholders in debates over emancipation, serving as an example of self-governance for the former and an example of political instability for the latter. By the early twentieth century, and with the U.S. South still under Jim Crow, the African-American community before and during the occupation had a vested interest in seeing Haiti succeed as a self-governing nation. Lord and Evans acted as U.S. missionary voices from Haiti, which helped influence African-American opinion over whether intervention and occupation in Haiti would help to strengthen and stabilize the so-called Black Republic or if it merely reduced the Haitians to the status of imperial subjects.

At the core of this work is determining how the activities of U.S. Baptist and AME missionaries in Haiti intersected with Wilsonian foreign policy in the region, specifically within the time frame of the years immediately preceding the 1915 invasion to the end of the U.S. occupation of Haiti in 1934. Reverend Evans was appointed as

pioneer U.S. Baptist missionary to Haiti by the National Baptist Convention in 1906.[11] Such an appointment suggests that Haiti had not been a serious focus of the Convention prior to 1906, and that this marks the beginning point for resumed U.S. missionary activity there. Though 1906 will be the starting point for the focus of this research, a brief exploration of missionary history in Haiti and the region during the preceding nineteenth century will provide a background and greater context. The occupation lasted until 1934 and as such this work will describe the role that U.S. missionaries served throughout the entirety of this period.

This study also briefly compares the interaction between U.S. foreign policy and U.S. missionaries across the various U.S.-occupied nations during the early twentieth century. Around the time of its intervention and occupation of Haiti, the United States also militarily intervened and occupied the Latin American nations of the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua. By examining the historiography regarding U.S. missionaries in the other occupied territories of the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua, this study will address if the interaction between missionaries and U.S. policy was a unique occurrence in Haiti, or if this interaction was part of a larger pattern found throughout. In doing so, this work will also demonstrate the historiographical gaps and challenges of including Haiti within the larger discussion of early twentieth century U.S. policy towards the Caribbean and Latin American region as well as the role of U.S. missionaries therein.

One significant challenge in utilizing the historiography of Haiti's position in early twentieth century U.S. policy towards region of the Caribbean and Latin America is

[11] Olsen, 27.

that, within the historiography, Haiti is often neglected in those studies. Because this regional historiography thus far has primarily focused on Latin America rather than the Caribbean, Haiti is often only mentioned in passing, if at all. For example, in Peter Smith's *Talons of the Eagle: Dynamics of U.S.-Latin American Relations* Haiti is not mentioned at all, and in Mark Gilderhus' *The Second Century: U.S.-Latin American Relations Since 1889* Haiti is only mentioned in passing with attention shared equally, yet sparingly, in parallel to Wilson's intervention in the Dominican Republic.[12] This level of representation is repeated in Abraham Lowenthal's *Exporting Democracy: The United States and Latin America: Case Studies* as Haiti is only mentioned in connection to the U.S. intervention, occupation, and subsequent Senate hearings regarding the Dominican Republic.[13] As neglect for the Caribbean in the general history of U.S. policy towards the region has resulted in neglect for Haiti as well, this study will also add to an understudied period of U.S.-Caribbean relations in the early twentieth century.

There are two instances within the historiography of Haitian history and U.S. interaction with Latin America and the Caribbean in which Haiti's frequent absence may be better understood and connect to this work's recovery of the role of Protestant missionaries in the intervention and occupation. In Lars Schoultz's *Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy Towards Latin America* Schoultz bluntly states that, when figuring what the occupation of Haiti meant to and within the Latin American

---

[12] Peter H. Smith, *Talons of the Eagle: Dynamics of U.S.-Latin American Relations*. Second Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000). Mark T. Gilderhus, *The Second Century: U.S.-Latin American Relations Since 1889* (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources Inc., 2000), 49.
[13] Jonathan Hartlyn, "The Dominican Republic: The Legacy of Intermittent Engagement", in *Exporting Democracy: The United States and Latin America: Case Studies*, edited by Abraham F. Lowenthal. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), 56, 59.

region as a whole, "Haiti was a problem because its citizens were black", and therefore not regarded as part of Latin America.[14] Schoultz supports this with two instances in which the U.S. government described the lack of reaction by the governments within Latin America to U.S. intervention in Haiti. The first is the prediction by Woodrow Wilson after the initial invasion of Haiti in 1915 that "the effect on 'Latin America' of our course down there will not, we think, be serious, because, being negroes, they are not regarded as of the fraternity!"[15] The second is a report from a U.S. chargé stationed in Bogota in 1929 concerning the largely dismissive reaction of the Colombian government to President Hoover's call to send additional troops to Haiti compared to similar actions in Nicaragua a few years earlier.[16] Schoultz also assigns an equal lack of concern or interest by the U.S. public in the occupation and later reported abuses of the Haitian population, though this study being conducted here will reveal these conclusions as problematic.

In Michel-Rolph Trouillot's *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of* History, Haiti's absence in this particular historiographical field focus is explained as a symptom of a much larger omission, in which the entire event of the Haitian Revolution and its impact on and across the region has been either overlooked entirely or minimalized by previous historians. Trouillot described the Haitian Revolution as "unthinkable history" in which the prevailing attitudes of race before, during and after the

[14] Lars Schoultz, *Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy Toward Latin America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 293.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Ibid.

events of 1791 to 1804 meant that historians in the U.S. and Europe, believing that African slaves were too "docile" and "obedient" by their nature to be capable of revolting, dismissed these events as impossible all the way into the 1940s.[17] As, according to Trouillot, these beliefs of natural docility among Africans and people of African descent, which were used as a means of justifying their subjugation to whites, persisted even beyond the 1915-1934 timeframe of the U.S. occupation of Haiti. This study will address Trouillot's thesis as it applies to Wilson and the U.S. missionaries in Haiti.

In the instances when Haiti is not omitted from the historiography of early twentieth century U.S. policy in the region, any role of significance to U.S. missionaries remains overlooked. James and James Cortada's *U.S. Foreign Policy in the Caribbean, Cuba, and Central America*, Wilfred Callcott's *The Caribbean Policy of the United States, 1890-1920*, and Lester Langley's *The United States in the Caribbean in the Twentieth Century*, all include the occupation of Haiti, but their summaries of these events offer no mention of missionaries such as L. Ton Evans or S.E. Churchstone Lord.[18] Callcott described the abuses of the Haitians reported in 1918, but his synopsis of these events were that improperly trained NCOs and poor government oversight due to the distraction of the First World War led to these abuses, which were then resolved by the subsequent Naval investigation.[19] The 1921 Senate hearings are also mentioned, but

[17] Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995), 72-74.
[18] James N. Cortada and James W. Cortada, *U.S. Foreign Policy in the Caribbean, Cuba, and Central America* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1985. Wildred Hardy Callcott, *The Caribbean Policy of the United States, 1890-1920* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1942).
[19] Calcott, 478-479.

only insofar as they concluded that a U.S. withdrawal at that time would have led to chaos in Haiti.[20] In neither instance, or anywhere else in the work for that matter, is the role of U.S. missionaries mentioned. There is little mention of U.S. missionaries at all throughout the historiography of early twentieth century U.S. policy in the region, and when they seldom are the role there are assigned is very different than what this study demonstrates occurred in Haiti during the occupation. Thomas O'Brien's *The Century of U.S. Capitalism in Latin America* is significant for two reasons: 1) Once again, Haiti is left out of this history of the Latin American region, and 2) Missionaries are only once mentioned and are described as agents of U.S. business interests. Claiming that U.S. Protestantism had long embraced the values of capitalism, such as individualism and competitiveness, O'Brien briefly describes a symbiotic relationship between U.S. missionaries and investors in Latin America as the missionaries emphasized the importance of promptness, individual betterment, cleanliness, and temperance to the populations that would work at the U.S. sugar and banana plantations of the Caribbean and the mining camps of South America.[21]

This portrayal of the role of U.S. Protestant missionaries in U.S. foreign policy in the Caribbean in the early twentieth century is challenged in this study. I argue that both Evans and Lord acted as a foil to U.S. political and economic imperialism in Haiti rather than as agents on its behalf. While this will not be the first study to argue that U.S. missionaries abroad in the early twentieth century engaged and sometimes challenged

[20] Calcott, 483.
[21] Thomas O'Brien, *The Century of U.S. Capitalism in Latin America* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1999), 53-54.

U.S. foreign policy, it will be the first to explore the extent to which this was the case U.S.-occupied Haiti and the surrounding region. Focusing primarily on U.S. Protestant missionaries to Asia in the 1940s through the 1960s, David Hollinger's *Protestants Abroad* challenges the perception of missionaries as agents of imperialism by instead describing them as inspiring criticism of U.S. imperialism from, and bringing foreign cultures and ideas back to, Protestant congregations in the U.S.[22] Ian Tyrrell's *Reforming the World*, also focusing predominantly on Protestant missions in Asia, portrays U.S. missionaries abroad as an essential part of the U.S. imperialism of the late nineteenth century, but as one that sought to morally reform that imperialism rather than merely support it. Tyrrell describes Protestant missionaries and morale reform organizations, as using the U.S. territorial expansion into the Philippines and Puerto Rico during and after the Spanish-American War as an opportunity to advance evangelism abroad.[23] Along with evangelizing to the indigenous peoples of these newly occupied territories, U.S. missionaries also sought to add their moral values to the occupying U.S. forces, largely in the form of temperance. Protestant missionary petitions and lobbying resulted in U.S. military reforms, such as the enactment in 1903 of a two-mile prohibition zone around all U.S. Army bases in the Philippines.[24]

While neither of these books examines the role of U.S. missionaries in Haiti, there are aspects to their analysis of U.S. missionaries in Asia that demonstrate what made

[22] David A. Hollinger, *Protestants Abroad: How Missionaries Tried to Change the World But Changed America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017), 2.
[23] Tyrrell, 125.
[24] Ibid, 130-131.

missionaries like L. Ton Evans and S.E. Churchstone Lord part of an overall pattern while also being unique to the situation of occupied Haiti. Both Tyrrell and Hollinger demonstrate that U.S. missionaries operating in Asia did engage in political activism to some degree. Hollinger describes U.S. missionaries at this time typically being engaged in global politics, and admiring Woodrow Wilson's vision of a world in which the great powers cooperated to promote and ensure the self-determination of all peoples around the world.[25] While this and Tyrrell's examples of U.S. missionaries successfully lobbying for temperance at the turn of the twentieth century demonstrate a larger pattern of political activism and engagement in U.S. policy regarding occupied territories, these are not the direct criticisms and challenges to U.S. policy that are seen in occupied Haiti. Evans and Lord gave up on trying to reform the U.S. occupation of Haiti early on and instead advocated for its end, separating their impact on U.S. policy from that of their contemporaries in other parts of the world. Though not discussing Haiti, Tyrrell also points out that U.S. missionaries made objections against what they viewed as coerced labor and excessive alcohol consumption by the Belgian forces during their occupation of the Congo.[26] This noted objection to the actions of a foreign army is important to consider as coerced labor of the Haitians by the U.S. occupational forces, whom Evans often blamed their abusive actions on frequent drunkenness, was the catalyst for Evans and Lord to turn against the occupation there. In the case of Haiti, we see that U.S.

[25] Hollinger, 9.
[26] Tyrrell, 131.

missionaries went even farther to condemn and challenge similar abuses when they appeared to be committed by their home nation.

To establish the extent in which U.S. missionaries impacted and challenged U.S. policy towards Haiti, Chapter One describes how the emergence of the Republic of Haiti impacted U.S. foreign policy in the region and how the nation's very existence influenced the U.S. abolition debate on both sides prior to the U.S. Civil War. It also explores the evolution of the role U.S. missionaries to Haiti played in both influencing government policy in both countries and in the pre-war abolition debate in the United States. Chapter Two demonstrates how U.S. missionaries navigated their role as intermediaries between the two nations as the U.S. Civil War and emerging U.S. imperialism placed the United States in a more active role in Haitian affairs.

Chapter Three demonstrates how, building upon the role of potentially partnering with the U.S. government, U.S. missionaries attempted to influence and interact with U.S. foreign policy to help stabilize Haiti as Haiti became more politically unstable and against the backdrop of the increasing global tensions of the First World War. Chapter Four focuses on how the U.S. administration of occupied Haiti created a rift between U.S. missionaries and that administration, and how Evans and Lord challenged the occupation. This chapter also compares the existing historiography of the parallel U.S. occupations of the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua to determine whether the actions of U.S. missionaries against U.S. policy seen in Haiti were unique or consistent across these three nations. Finally, Chapter Five utilizes press coverage of the occupation and U.S. missionary reactions to it to gauge how these missionaries impacted U.S. public opinion

regarding the occupation. Historians such as Renda and J. Michael Dash have pointed out how travel literature about Haiti during this time told wild tales of Haitians committing human sacrifices and cannibalism, which were used to justify the U.S.'s "civilizing mission" in the U.S. public eye.[27] In examining the U.S. press coverage regarding missionaries and the occupation, it will be demonstrated that a different form of publication produced a contesting effect on U.S. public opinion.

This project concludes with a synopsis of its findings as to the role, and its significance, of U.S. missionaries in shaping and challenging the U.S. occupation of Haiti, and how Haiti was in many ways a unique case study in this regard. What this study adds to our understanding of the U.S. intervention and occupation of Haiti is that U.S. missionaries were significant actors during these events. While the existing historiography describes how the Wilson administration came to its decision to intervene, and how mishandling the subsequent occupation resulted in Haitian resentment and a Senate inquiry that eventually led to that occupation's end, what this study reveals is how instrumental U.S. missionaries L. Ton Evans and S.E. Churchstone Lord were in that outcome. As Evans and Lord became aware of abuses of the Haitian population by the U.S. Marines and the Haitian gendarmes under their command, Evans became a key source of information for U.S. Republicans such as Harding to launch an investigation into Wilson's occupation of Haiti. Lord likewise became a key source of information for the AME Church and the NAACP, who in turn brought African-American public

[27] J. Michael Dash, *Haiti and the United States: National Stereotypes and the Literary Imagination*. Second Edition (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998), 22.

attention to the abuses in Haiti. This study also reveals that both Evans and Lord were influential in shaping the general U.S. public's opinion of the occupation via the Press, thereby eroding public support all the way until 1934. Finally, this study also reveals that the U.S. missionaries in Haiti challenged their home government's occupational policy in ways that were unique in the region and in the early twentieth century.

CHAPTER II

AMERICA'S DIVIDED OPINION OF HAITI: ABOLITIONISTS, ANTI-ABOLITIONISTS, AND MISSIONARIES PRIOR TO THE U.S. CIVIL WAR

The U.S. invasion of Haiti in 1915, as well as the presence of U.S. missionaries there in the years just prior to it, were neither spontaneous nor unrelated occurrences. Rather, the presence of both U.S. soldiers and missionaries during the occupation between 1915-1934 were the culmination of the relationships both the U.S. government and U.S. religious organizations had developed with Haiti since the late eighteenth century. While the two groups developed their mutual relationships with Haiti and its people independently, their mutual goals and the events that advanced or hindered them kept the two groups interconnected as both set out with a vision for the future of Haiti. That vision changed over time for both U.S. officials and missionaries, yet the interconnection between the U.S. and Haitian governments, and U.S. missionaries and the Haitian people, continued from the foundation of the Haitian Republic in 1804 into the occupation. From its very beginning, Haiti was for the United States an intersection for the overlapping forces of race, religion, and empire. How the three forces shaped and interacted with each other remained in a state of flux all the way into the nineteen-year U.S. occupation, and to understand how these forces shaped the invasion and occupation, it is important to understand how their intersection led up to it.

Independence

The United States and Haiti were the first two nations in the Americas to declare their independence from the European powers. That status, accompanied by the circumstances of their movements towards independence, locked the two nations into an enduring and complex relationship. The initial relationship between the United States and Haiti was one of alliance and military assistance. With France as an ally against the British during the American Revolution, and Saint Domingue (renamed Haiti after gaining independence in 1804) being a French colony at the time, the American forces relied on supplies and troops that came directly from Saint Domingue. One prominent example of French assistance coming from what would later become Haiti was John Adams' response to the safe arrival of a French "convoy and sixty sail of merchant ships" from Saint Domingue to supply the American forces, which he referred to as "a great event for this country (France) and for ours".[1] While relations between the United States and France later soured after the conclusion of the American Revolution, this early support by way of Saint Domingue would be remembered in U.S. policy towards Haiti during the Adams administration.

The support that Saint Domingue provided to American forces during the war went beyond merely being a nearby port from which to send supplies and troops from France. In 1779, former colonial governor of Saint Domingue, Charles d'Etaing, arrived in Georgia with an expeditionary force made up largely of volunteers of African descent

[1] Ronald Angelo Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White: John Adams, Toussaint Louverture, and Their Atlantic World Alliance* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2014), 14.

that he recruited directly from Saint Domingue.[2] As free people of color would come to play a significant role in the later Haitian Revolution, their direct participation in the American Revolution demonstrates how interconnected the two nations were at their beginnings, and would continue to be from that point onward. The forces of the d'Etaing expedition engaged British forces in Savannah and, while the engagement ended in a French defeat, the free-colored unit distinguished itself in the campaign by holding the line against advancing British troops while d'Etraing's force was in retreat.[3] Few accounts exist of the role of the Saint Domingue soldiers in this battle, and the details are limited to the engagement itself without elaborating on how these soldiers were received by their American allies.[4] A monument erected in 2007 in Savannah's Franklin Square stands as belated recognition of the Haitian contribution to U.S. independence.

After the Americans had won their independence from Great Britain, the relationship between the newly formed United States and the future Republic of Haiti shifted from one of assistance to dependence. After the American Revolution ended, and the British during the 1780s closed their Caribbean ports to the United States, the new nation out of necessity intensified its trade with the French West Indies.[5] As the largest and most productive of those French colonies, Saint Domingue was an essential trading partner for the United States to begin its emergence as a new nation and regional power. Saint Domingue's primary exports of sugar, coffee, and indigo were exchanged for

---

[2] Laurent Dubois, *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004), 65.
[3] Dubois, *Avengers of the New World*, 66.
[4] George P. Clark, "The Role of the Haitian Volunteers at Savannah in 1779: An Attempt at an Objective View," *Phylon (1960-)* 41, no. 4 (1980), 357.
[5] Johnson, 14.

American cattle, flour, iron and lumber as both met each other's material needs.[6] Despite the fact that relations between France and the United States soured dramatically by the 1790s, the relationship between the U.S. and Saint Domingue continued as one of mutual benefit. As relations with Great Britain normalized, and the United States entered into a quasi-war with France in the late 1790s, trade continued between the U.S. and Saint Domingue in spite of a commerce embargo on France and French dependencies by President Adams and the U.S. Congress on June 13, 1798.[7]

Although much of the complexity of the relationship between the United States and what would become Haiti was based on the issue of race, the relationship did not begin that way. Prior to the Haitian Revolution, military interaction and economic dependence made the U.S. and Saint Domingue early partners. This continued as the Haitian Revolution began, as well as after Haitian independence. Yet the issue of race, ever present between U.S. and Haitian interaction after 1791, made this relationship much more complicated. This shift in 1791 is important to understanding both the American intervention that came in 1915 and the missionaries involved. Ultimately, racial issues in both countries were the trigger for U.S. missionary activities in Haiti to begin post-independence.

With the 1791 slave uprising in Saint Domingue, the complexity of that revolution made the relationship between Saint Domingue and the United States one that was prone to shifts depending on the U.S. administration. As the United States emerged

[6] Johnson, 14
[7] Ibid.

from the American Revolution with the institution of slavery still very much intact, how exactly it should respond to the uprising in Saint Domingue was a matter of intense debate. While some favored supporting the movement to curtail French power in the region, others feared what a successful Caribbean slave revolt might trigger in the American slave-holding states. Support for France in the 1790s was split between sympathy from the Democratic-Republicans, and antipathy by the Federalists, but initially the overall fear of rebellious slaves superseded the fear of France. Washington himself was so convinced that the black uprising threatened American interests that he intervened on behalf of the white planters of Saint Domingue by advancing them $726,000 to purchase weapons, munitions, and supplies.[8] After John Adams replaced Washington as President of the United States in 1797, American policy towards the ongoing revolution did a complete reversal. Remembering the vital role that trade with Saint Domingue had played both during and immediately after the American Revolution, and applying his Federalist scorn for France, Adams pursued a policy of offering support to the Haitian rebels against the French.

Though not the political upheaval that accompanied Napoleon's seizure of power in 1799, the election of Thomas Jefferson as the American President in 1800 sparked another dramatic shift in that nation's policy towards Saint Domingue. A slaveholder himself, Jefferson pursued a policy of containment towards Saint Domingue, but the threat of French expansion into the Americas forced him to balance that policy in a way

[8] David Brion Davis, *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 159.

that kept both in check. With the growing likelihood of French defeat in Saint Domingue, and a desire to weaken France's position in the region in the hopes of securing French territory in North America that would result in the Louisiana Purchase, he began to adopt a policy leaning towards the colony's independence. Correspondence between Jefferson and French Representative Pichon dated October 31, 1801 demonstrates the U.S. President's vision of a Saint Domingue that was both independent yet contained. "Why should not the three powers (France, the United States, and Britain) unite to confine the pest in the island? Provided that the Negroes are not permitted to possess a navy, we can allow them without danger to exist and we can moreover continue with them very lucrative commercial relations".[9] Such an agreement never came about as the Leclerc Expedition crumbled, and France was forced to withdraw from the colony.

That much of the historiography concerning the early interactions between the new United States and Saint Domingue/Haiti has focused on the policies of Washington, Adams, and Jefferson is understandable and valuable. Ronald Johnson's argument on John Adams's support and collaboration with the Haitian Revolution, Arthur Scherr's argument of Thomas Jefferson's at least lukewarm support, and Tim Matthewson's contrasting argument that Washington, Adams, and Jefferson were all racially motivated to oppose the Haitian Revolution, signify an ongoing discussion among historians over early U.S.-Haitian political interaction.[10] But this interaction understood solely through

[9] Thomas Jefferson, "To French Representative Pichon, 31 October 1801," in *The Haitian Revolution: A Documentary History*, ed. David Geggus (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2014), 197.
[10] Ronald Angelo Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White: John Adams, Toussaint Louverture, and Their Atlantic World Alliance* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2014). Tim Matthewson, *A Proslavery Foreign Policy: Haitian-American Relations during the Early Republic* (Westport: Praeger Publishers,

this lens suffers from limitations. Echoing the same issue that the overall focus of this study on the U.S. intervention and occupation of Haiti encounters with a historiography that largely views these events through the lens of Woodrow Wilson, understanding the interactions between the U.S. and Haiti solely through the lens of Washington, Adams, and Jefferson only provides us with a strictly U.S. high office perspective about a nation these men never actually set foot on. In contrast to the U.S. missionaries that entered Haiti shortly after independence, these perspectives of the Haitian Revolution and its aftermath do not benefit from any direct interaction with Haitians during these events. While neither perspective can give us these events from the Haitian viewpoint, the missionary perspective does provide us with more insight into how race, religion, and empire interacted between the U.S. and Haiti from the early days of the Haitian Republic to the occupation. The transnational issue of race in particular is both the catalyst for U.S. missionary activity in Haiti and the cause behind the complexity of the role these missionaries had to play living between the competing goals of two nations.

Abolition

Abolition became the defining question in how the U.S. and Haiti interacted with each other between 1804 and 1862. For the purposes of this study, the abolition movement in the United States and how Haiti impacted it needs to be understood to both clarify the development of U.S. policy towards Haiti prior to 1915 and why U.S. missionaries were motivated to engage Haiti. The Haitian Revolution lasted from 1791 to

2003). Arthur Scherr, *Thomas Jefferson's Haitian Policy: Myths and Realities* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2011).

1804, ultimately resulting in Saint Domingue declaring itself an independent nation and renaming itself Haiti after the original Taino (the pre-Columbian inhabitants of the island) name 'Ayiti".[11] For the new republic it was a chance for a new beginning, or at least it must have seemed so on that first day of the year 1804. However, the brutal finale of their conflict with the French, as well as the Haitian response to it immediately upon gaining their independence set the course for decades of international isolation as well as ongoing political and financial calamity.

In the final phase of the revolution, desperate to regain control of the colony, the French forces had attempted to carry out a campaign of genocide against the Haitians.[12] While the Haitians who initially rose up against Napoleon were led by Toussaint Louverture, his capture by French forces paved the way for the rise of his successor: Jean-Jacques Dessalines. After Dessalines had led the Haitians to victory over the French force that had been attempting their eradication, the Haitians found themselves in a position to return the favor. In a move that would ultimately poison Haiti's international relations for the next hundred years, Dessalines in retribution ordered a massacre of the remaining white population in Haiti.[13] This massacre, while it resulted in Haiti's isolation by the Atlantic powers, was not one that applied across the board for all whites in the new republic. Dessalines made no attempt to hide the reciprocity he had ordered in his Proclamation on April 28, 1804:

[11] Dubois, *Avengers of the New World*, 299.
[12] Ibid, 290-292.
[13] Ibid, 300.

> Yes, I have saved my country; I have avenged America. It is my pride and my glory that I admit it in the face of both mortals and the gods. It matters not how the people of today and of the future will judge me. I have done my duty; I have kept my self-esteem; that is enough for me . . . . It is not my only reward. I have seen two classes of men, born to love and help one another, at last mixed together as one, rushing to vengeance and disputing the honor of striking the first blows. Blacks and coloreds, you whom the refined duplicity of the Europeans sought so long to divide, who today make up . . . but one family, have no doubt that your perfect reconciliation needed to be sealed with the blood of our executioners.[14]

Dessalines' proclamation continued, however, with the caveat that whites who had been supportive of the revolution and had sufficiently proven their loyalty to the new regime would be exempted from this purge.

> As punishing a few innocents for the deeds of their fellow would be repugnant to my honor and character, I have shown mercy to a handful of whites distinguished by the opinions they have always held and who, besides, have taken the oath to live with us obedient to the law. I order that they receive no punishment and that their activities and persons remain unharmed.[15]

Though the decree to punish the white population was not a call for complete genocide, the damage to future international relations between the new republic and both the United States and the European powers in the region was done. To President Jefferson, and other slaveholders across the U.S. South, their worst fears had been realized. An army of enslaved blacks had risen up, overthrown their masters, and massacred the white population in retribution, and all of this had occurred at a relatively short distance from the shores of the slaveholding U.S. South. The birth of the Haitian

[14] Jean-Jacques Dessalines, "Dessalines' Proclamation, 28 April 1804," in *The Haitian Revolution: A Documentary History*, ed. David Geggus (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2014), 181.
[15] Ibid, 182.

Republic, and the idea of a nation founded on the overthrow of slavery, forced the U.S. to reevaluate the institution of slavery within its own borders and provided ammunition for arguments on both sides of the issue. Early abolitionists initially viewed Haiti as potential proof that freed slaves were indeed capable of self-governance after emancipation, or at the very least served as a cautionary tale for white slaveholders as to what could happen if slavery were to continue indefinitely. For pro-slavery forces in the U.S., the Haitian massacre of the white population was used, not as a cautionary tale of why slavery must end, but of why emancipation could never be allowed.

While the account of these events by Dessalines does at least bring in a piece of the Haitian perspective, the historiography ironically suffers from the same problem found in focusing only on Washington, Adams, and Jefferson. Largely biographical histories such as C.L.R. James's *The Black Jacobins* and Philippe Girard's *Toussaint Louverture: A Revolutionary Life*, which focuses on the role of Toussaint L'Ouverture, and Deborah Jenson's *Beyond the Slave Narrative* and Philippe Girard's *The Slaves Who Defeated Napoleon*, which focus on both L'Ouverture and Jean Jacques Dessalines, are valuable in our understanding of Haitian agency in these events. However, that our Haitian perspective of their revolution is based exclusively on the accounts of people such as Toussaint L'Ouverture and Jean-Jacques Dessalines is as limiting to our understanding of how issues of religion, race, and empire shaped and were shaped by U.S. and Haitian interaction as viewing these events solely through the policies of U.S. Presidents. In whatever manner the political elites influenced the interactions between the two countries, both in the aftermath of their mutual independence and into the twentieth

century, this perspective does not inform us of the transnational relationship in its entirety, and to leave it at that would belie the greater complexities of that relationship. As we have seen, U.S. policies towards Haiti were frequently subject to change and, as we shall see in this study, Americans who directly interacted with Haitians were often not in lockstep with U.S. foreign policy.

Even among the slave-holding planters of the U.S. South, whose mutual interests Jefferson worked to represent, the response to Haiti's existence has been shown to be somewhat mixed. For Jefferson, closing the U.S. slave trade would not be enough to stop the spread of Haitian revolutionary ideas that he feared would infiltrate the slave-holding states of the U.S. It was this fear that pushed Jefferson to pursue policies that effectively quarantined Haiti diplomatically and economically, which also squared the U.S.'s Haitian policy with that of Britain and France. However, it is important to note that, while Jefferson and the southern planter class were concerned about the potential consequences of the Haitian Revolution, there is evidence to support that there was a greater degree of complexity among their responses to this event than Jefferson's quarantine of Haiti alone suggests. Perhaps the greatest complicating factor in terms of how the southern planters should react to the Haitian Revolution was the issue of France.

With the Quasi-War at the end of the eighteenth century and the rise of Napoleon having tempered the pro-French sentiments once held by Jefferson and the Democrat-Republicans, even slave holding Americans found it difficult to favor a French victory. According to the argument put forth in Alfred Hunt's *Haiti's Influence on Antebellum America*, despite concerns over the slave insurrection in Saint Domingue, southern slave

owners tended to be more worried about France than about a repeat of 1791 simply because the French posed a much more immediate threat to their plans to expand into the Mississippi Valley.[16] Such fears of a French threat to the southern planters' future plans were echoed in Paul Lachance's *Repercussions of the Haitian Revolution in Louisiana,* who argued that the expansionist policies of Napoleon created a competition for expansion in the region. By bringing the Louisiana Territory under French imperial control, this region could provide foodstuffs to France's Caribbean colonies, thereby eliminating those colonies' dependence on trade with the United States.[17] This in turn would have allowed French expansion of the number of Caribbean colonies, and thereby greater regional military mobility.

It is something of a historical irony that the U.S. southern slave owners could find cause for celebration in the Haitians' victory over France. The successful slave uprising that had ultimately led to the collapse of French rule had provided a win for them as well. With France no longer willing or able to pursue its North American empire, the Jefferson government found itself in a prime position in 1803 to negotiate for the American acquisition of the Louisiana Territory, thereby granting the westward expansion of slave-holding territory in the Mississippi Valley. However, the widespread southern slave owners' positive reaction to the aftermath of the Haitian Revolution was based on more than just their resulting territorial gains. An even greater irony in the aftermath was how

---

[16] Alfred N. Hunt, *Haiti's Influence on Antebellum America: Slumbering Volcano in the Caribbean* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988), 87.
[16] Paul Lachance, "*Repercussions of the Haitian Revolution in Louisiana*," in *The Impact of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World*, ed. David P. Geggus (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001), 210.

Toussaint Louverture became something of a southern hero. Not only had southern slave owners praised a former slave's stance against a major European power as a triumph of the New World over the Old, but they also praised Toussaint's conservative governing style of positive treatment of the white planters in Saint Domingue as well as stabilizing the work force.[18] This method of stabilizing the workforce, which made Toussaint popular with southern slave owners, was by contrast one of the strongest criticisms black, formerly enslaved Haitians held against him. To economically revitalize the colony after being devastated during the course of the Revolution, Toussaint adopted a policy that forced many of these Haitians back to the plantations that they had previously worked during slavery. Although this labor was now compensated, it was a problematic policy for a nation whose national identity was tethered to overthrowing slavery. Even more problematic was that this policy established a precedent that was used later by the Americans during the occupation, which served as a trigger point for Haitian and U.S. missionary resistance against said occupation.

Toussaint Louverture was not the only name that made an impression on the southern slave holders in the wake of the Haitian Revolution. Jean Jacques Dessalines also was an example for them to draw from, but unlike Toussaint's positive image in the U.S. South the image of Dessalines was an example of the necessity to maintain slavery at all costs. Toussaint was a figure of the Haitian Revolution that southerners felt they could use to further their arguments to justify slavery. According to their view, the impressive sugar and coffee production of the colony that preceded the abolition of

[18] Hunt, 87.

slavery along with Toussaint's policy of forced labor and non-retribution against former slave masters supported slavery apologists who argued that blacks would only work when forced.[19] The end of Toussaint's reign, and the independence Haiti gained under Dessalines was likewise exploited by slavery apologists as evidence of the consequences of abolition. Being both the first Haitian ruler and the first of many who would be assassinated, as well as the architect of the massacre of Haiti's white population after taking office, slavery apologists viewed Dessalines as proof that abolition would lead to disorder and violent retribution. The fact that Haiti continued to decline economically in the wake of the Revolution was seen by southerners as all the more damning of black leadership. In the slave-holding states of the U.S., Toussaint was held up as a pillar of stability and forgiveness because, in their minds, he maintained something of the peculiar institution, whereas Dessalines was assigned the role of the villain whose embrace of abolition was blamed for Haiti's violence and economic decay.[20] As the nineteenth century continued, Haiti was an exemplar to both sides as the arguments in the U.S. for and against slavery continued to divide the nation.

Much to the misfortune of the first and many successive generations of Haitians, the southern slave owners' view of Toussaint as a figure who maintained slavery in a nation formed on the renunciation of that institution are not entirely baseless, though the reality was again more complex. Despite enforcing equality before the law and officially and permanently abolishing slavery, Toussaint not only maintained a forced labor system

[19] Hunt, 89.
[20] Ibid, 91.

for ex-slaves but also reopened the slave trade from Africa to replenish this system's workforce.[21] One significant factor, of which southern slave owners got wrong, was the assumption that Dessalines had not pursued the same policy of forced labor. Toussaint and Dessalines were merely the first practitioners of a form of presidential monarchism that would employ state power to compel former slaves to become a servile workforce over the next four decades after independence.[22] Leadership in Haiti would change hands frequently, and all too often violently, but the style of leadership that emphasized executive power while forcing the population to work in a renewed plantation system remained during the early nineteenth century.

Understanding the policy of forced labor utilized by Toussaint and Dessalines is not only important for interpreting divided American opinions over Haiti and its independence but was a crucial element in how missionaries and U.S. policy become antagonistic to each other during the 1915-1934 occupation. Already a point of controversy among the Haitian population when their leaders used it during the early nineteenth century, forced labor was later reused by the U.S. occupying forces in order to streamline Haitian infrastructure projects. Viewed by many Haitians as little more than slavery by another name when their government imposed it, its later use by a foreign white military force only exacerbated that perception. Furthermore, the abuses against the population that came with this policy's use are what would ultimately turn U.S. missionaries against the occupation.

---

[21] David Geggus, *The Haitian Revolution: A Documentary History* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2014), 141.
[22] Robert Fatton Jr., *The Roots of Haitian Despotism* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2007), 81.

While southern slave owners pointed to the political and economic instability in Haiti to further their arguments against black self-governance, what seems to be lost in that assessment is that much of Haiti's economic troubles, which fed into its political strife, were caused by external forces rather than internal factors. With the sugar and coffee plantation infrastructure that had supplied its thriving economy before the Revolution in ruins after independence, Haiti found itself needing to rebuild economically. The fact that France, defeated but refusing to recognize Haiti's independence, placed a trade embargo that was agreed to by both Great Britain and the United States, Haiti after 1804 found itself economically shattered and unable to trade with any of the three largest regional powers. French diplomatic recognition and a lift to the embargo did not occur until 1825, when France forced Haiti to pay a 150-million-franc indemnity to compensate France for its war-time losses, further worsening Haiti's economic situation. The result was a nation that was economically crippled and trying to overcome its woes by harsh, enforced labor of its populace on the very plantations from which they had fought to be liberated. This in turn continued to feed social unrest against the Haitian government, leading to frequent changes in government.

Despite the quarantine of Haiti that Jefferson put in place, and both the official adherence to the French embargo by the United States and Britain, unofficially the trade relationship between Haiti and the U.S. did not completely disappear in the years following Haitian Independence. The economic relationship between the U.S. and Haiti had survived France's shifting political winds throughout the late eighteenth century, so the embargo of the early nineteenth century proved to be nothing more than a new hurdle

for U.S. merchants, and even the U.S. government, to jump, albeit discreetly. With merchants from the ports of Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York already heavily engaged in trade with the Caribbean by the time the Haitian Revolution had begun, the Revolution itself did not so much disrupt U.S. trade to Saint Domingue as it did diversify it by providing opportunities to establish relationships with the French forces as well as the rebel forces.[23] These merchants only needed to remember the precedent of the turn of the nineteenth century to be confident that the U.S. government would turn a blind eye to business as usual with Haiti. Despite the renewed embargo by the U.S. against the French empire in 1799, the Federalist majority of the U.S. Congress passed an amendment to the bill known as the "Toussaint Clause", which allowed U.S. merchants to continue trade with semi-autonomous Saint Domingue.[24]

Once the French were defeated by the Haitians in 1803, the quarantine by Jefferson was neither immediate, nor terribly effective in curtailing continued U.S.-Haitian trade. For two years after Haiti declared its independence in 1804, the U.S. merchants who visited Haitian ports were among the new nation's most important trading partners as these merchants brought provisions and materiel in exchange for coffee, cotton, and mahogany.[25] When the U.S. Congress banned trade with Haiti in 1806 with the official goals of isolating the anti-slavery fervor of the Haitian Revolution and improving relations with France, in practice the U.S. adherence to France's embargo

[23] Julia Gaffield. *Haitian Connections in the Atlantic World: Recognition After Revolution* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 126-127.
[24] Ibid, 127.
[25] Ibid.

proved to be largely lip service. Thereafter, the United States did not formally trade with Haiti, or diplomatically acknowledge it as an independent nation, this was little more than an inconvenience for U.S. merchants who were reported by at least one French agent in St. Thomas to be circumventing the embargo by either lying about their destinations in their paperwork or by sailing under other flags.[26]

While the issue of race and the question of abolition are vital components of understanding U.S.-Haitian interactions prior to 1915, they did not always monopolize the two countries' relationship. U.S. economic interests superseded both internal concerns of southern slaveholders pressuring Congress to contain the "Black Republic" and external political concerns of Franco-U.S. relations, as the U.S. weakly enforced the embargo during the brief period of time it was allowed to continue. To ensure that the British would not secure its own trade monopoly in Haiti during the embargo, U.S. merchants continued to do business until the U.S. embargo was ended in 1810.[27] Since trade with Haiti had never effectively ceased, it took little time for the U.S. to reestablish official trade after 1810. In 1813 U.S. commercial agents were appointed to Port-au-Prince and Cap Haitien, and by 1820 nearly half of Haiti's imports were being supplied by U.S. merchants.[28] While the U.S. economic quarantine of Haiti after independence was neither long-term nor effective, the United States would nevertheless continue to withhold diplomatic recognition out of fear of embracing a nation founded on the rejection of race-based slavery. As the debate over the issue of slavery in the U.S. grew

[26] Gaffield, 127.
[27] Ibid, 152.
[28] Ibid.

more and more volatile as the nineteenth century progressed, it would take a cataclysm for the United States to finally answer the questions of what to do about the issues of slavery and recognizing Haiti.

While the historiography mentioned here has demonstrated that the early relationship between the United States and Haiti was complicated by questions of race and empire, it is still only a story from the perspectives of political elites from both nations. There is some sense of how the southern planters understood and responded to the Haitian Revolution, but this too is only the perspective of U.S. elites, though not necessarily political elites, who likely had limited if any direct interaction with the Haitian population. Much as it is with the historiography of the U.S. intervention and occupation, the early interactions between the newly formed United States and Haiti has thus far been viewed through political and economic lenses. By studying the interactions between U.S. missionaries and Haitians, both in the nineteenth century as well as this study's focus on the early twentieth century, our understanding of these events can go beyond, though still very much include, solely political and economic perspectives.

American Perceptions of Haiti

Though the southern planters are not the focus of this study, their perspectives of Haiti and what its very existence meant provides us with a counterpoint against which U.S. missionaries entered the debate over Haiti. However, determining what independent Haiti actually meant to Americans prior to the U.S. Civil War is a matter of debate. In his chapter on the Jeffersonian Republican response to the Haitian Revolution within the edited collection *The Impact of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World*, Simon

Newman summarizes the conflicting views of fellow historians found within the collection concerning the impact the revolution had on slavery throughout the Atlantic world. In terms of its overall impact on the U.S., historians David Brion Davis and Robin Blackburn argue that the Haitian Revolution accelerated emancipation in the U.S. and British Empire, while Seymour Drescher cautions that slavery nevertheless remained a fixture of the economies of the Atlantic world for decades after 1804.[29] Having already discussed the policies of Washington, Adams, and Jefferson it is clear that the idea of the Haitian Revolution was believed to pose a threat to slaveholders in the U.S., but to what extent? Already pointed out is that the threat of external European empires could supersede fears of internal slave revolts, and Ashli White argues that the defeat of well-armed whites against supposedly inferior blacks in Saint Domingue led to Americans forsaking transnational bonds of race to rationalize their defeat as the result of white Saint Dominguans being more decadent and depraved than white Americans.[30]

Despite the attempts by the southern planters to insulate themselves from what they viewed as the failures of the white planters of Saint Domingue, and the complexity of navigating internal and external threats in the Atlantic world, that the Haitian Revolution posed a threat to the U.S. slaveholding states. Both Sylvia Fey and Alfred Hunt argue in favor of Drescher's argument that, rather than accelerating emancipation, the Haitian Revolution resulted in southern planters breaking up black communication

[29] Simon P. Newman, "American Political Culture and the French and Haitian Revolutions: Nathaniel Cutting and the Jeffersonian Republicans", in *The Impact of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World*, edited by David P. Geggus. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001), 72.
[30] Ashli White, "The Saint-Dominguan Refugees and American Distinctiveness in the Early Years of the Haitian Revolution", in *The World of the Haitian Revolution*, edited by David Patrick Geggus and Norman Fiering. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009), 248.

networks, censoring news about Haiti, and fortifying themselves militarily against potential slave revolts.[31] Further into the Antebellum period, Matthew Clavin argues that there is evidence to support a genuine fear by slaveholders on the eve of the U.S. Civil War that abolitionists were conspiring with free blacks in the North, Canada, and Haiti to launch a military invasion of the South.[32] How Americans attempted to understand and explain the Haitian Revolution created the circumstances by which U.S. missionaries challenged and shaped the relationship between the two nations. The historiography suggests that the southern planters attempted to rationalize how such an uprising was a failure on the part of the French, and not a success of the Haitians nor an indictment of the institution of slavery, while at the same time preparing for just such an event. Assigning blame for the failures of white supremacy in Saint Domingue was a way that southern planters faced the unthinkable, and in doing so brought U.S. missionaries into the larger debate on abolition.

In the years during the Haitian Revolution and immediately following Haitian independence, U.S. reactions to these events particularly among the slave-holding South have been shown to have been mixed in terms of its positive or negative figures and consequences. However, as the Antebellum Period progressed, one viewpoint over who and what was responsible for these events appears to have dominated the American understanding of the Haitian Revolution. As a Member of the British Parliament, West

---

[31] Maurice Jackson and Jacqueline Bacon, "Fever and Fret: The Haitian Revolution and African American Responses", in *African Americans and the Haitian Revolution: Selected Essays and Historical Documents*, edited by Maurice Jackson and Jacqueline Bacon. (New York: Routledge, 2010), 13-14.
[32] Matthew J. Clavin, *Toussaint Louverture and the American Civil War: The Promise and Peril of a Second Haitian Revolution* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 72.

Indian planter, and historian of the Caribbean region, the eyewitness account of Bryan Edwards's 1797 work *Historical Survey of the French Colony of St. Domingo* became the most influential proslavery treatise in Antebellum America concerning the Haitian Revolution.[33] A reading of Edwards' survey makes it quite clear that he placed the blame for the outbreak of the rebellion entirely at the feet of the abolitionists in Britain as well as in France, specifically pointing to the French abolitionist organization, Les Amis des Noirs. Edwards' accuses the British abolitionists of inciting bloodshed by urging slaves to "rise up and murder their masters without mercy", indoctrinating blacks while in England to return to the West Indies with abolitionist ideas, and essentially doing everything to encourage a slave rebellion "except that of furnishing the objects of their folicitude with fire arms and ammunition".[34] Against the French government and Les Amis des Noirs, Edwards leveled even stronger accusations. Along with viewing the May 15, 1791 decree by the French government abolishing slavery throughout its territories as the catalyst of the Haitian revolt that August, he theorizes that the uprising was only possible through "the agency of the mulattoes, and the connections of those people in France, they could obtain a regular supply of arms and ammunition".[35] This accusation not only demonstrates Edwards' view that French abolitionists went so far as to supply the weapons that made the Haitian uprising possible, but also his racial assumptions that

---

[33] Edward Bartlett Rugemer, *The Problem of Emancipation: The Caribbean Roots of the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 2009), 43.
[34] Bryan Edwards, *An Historical Survey of the French Colony in the Island of St. Domingo: Comprehending a Short Account of its Ancient Government, Political State, Population, Productions, and Exports; A Narrative of the Calamities Which Have Desolated the Country Ever Since the Year 1789, with Some Reflections on Their Causes and Probable Consequences; and a Detail of the Military Transactions of the British Army in That Island to the End of 1794* (London: J. Stockdale, 1797), 84-85.
[35] Ibid, 86-87.

the black slaves in Saint Domingue could not have risen up without aid and direction from whites and mulattoes.

Edwards' *History* was influential on both sides of the Atlantic. After being published in three editions in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, in 1805 a Philadelphia printer, James Humphreys, published a fourth edition in four volumes in the United States.[36] Subscriptions poured in from across the country and from some of the most influential Americans of the time, including Thomas Jefferson, as well as lawyers, clergymen, and physicians from Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia.[37] After the 1805 edition quickly sold out, another printing was ordered the following year to include a separate atlas.[38] As the American appetite for Edwards' treatise on the perceived dangers of abolition continued to grow, publication had to be expanded even further. The four-volume work was reissued once again in 1810, but this time by three different printers in Philadelphia, Charleston, and Baltimore.[39] Edwards had an impact on nineteenth century America's debate over slavery, and the case of Haiti played a significant role in that discussion. Both the circumstances of Haiti's independence, and the success or failure of that new nation, fueled the argument all the way to the outbreak of the Civil War.

[36] Rugemer, 52.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Ibid, 53.
[39] Ibid.

Evangelism

The conflicts between missionaries and government policy were not new in the early twentieth century, nor were they limited to Haiti. That Edwards placed so much of the blame for the Haitian Revolution on white abolitions is consistent with Michel-Rolph Trouillot's concept of the revolution as "unthinkable history". Using examples of accounts from French colonists in St. Domingue describing the colony's slaves mere months before the initial violence broke out as "very tranquil and obedient. A revolt among them is impossible", and "without a single thought of their uprising unless that was fomented by the whites themselves", Trouillot demonstrates that the prevailing view during and after the Haitian Revolution was that black slaves would have been incapable of even considering rebellion and their own freedom were it not for white influence.[40] While Trouillot makes the case that racial prejudice shaped the understanding of the revolution by contemporaries and historians alike, he ignores a subgroup within the abolitionists whom received a significant portion of the blame for inciting slave rebellion. In his *History*, Edwards included another accusation towards British abolitionists in the West Indies that points to a critical element in the spread of abolitionist philosophy throughout the Atlantic world. As part of the abolitionist strategy to foment rebellion among black slaves in the West Indies, Edwards listed the distribution of pamphlets at the doors of churches and other places of worship in the kingdom and throughout the colonies, as a standard tactic.[41] This speaks to the larger role that Christianity played in

[40] Trouillot, 72-73.
[41] Edwards, 84.

abolitionism, as the institution of slavery came to be portrayed within the movement as an evil for which the societies who practiced them would eventually come under divine judgment. Since the colonization of the Americas, the spread of each empire into the hemisphere was accompanied by both the evolution of the institution of race-based slavery as well as the spread of various forms of Christianity. Both were initially favored by each of the imperial powers as a means of strengthening their positions across their far-flung colonial possessions, and yet in some cases both the question of slavery and spreading Christianity resulted in challenging state authority. As arguments for abolition in the nineteenth century were often tied to Christian beliefs concerning salvation, state-supported slavery in the Americas would become increasingly challenged by Christian missionaries. Those who had been encouraged by the state to homogenize colonial populations in some cases became threats to the system the colonial empire was based upon.

Throughout the remaining colonies of the British and French Caribbean in the early nineteenth century, missionaries from both empires became commonplace, much to the growing chagrin of the colonial slaveholders there. At issue was the question of whether missionaries should teach and spread Christianity among the slaves of the West Indies. While slaveholders had no qualms with reinforcing among their slaves the Christian conceptualizations of obedience and submission to authority, the message that the missionaries taught included other aspects of Christian theology such as critical reflection, personal responsibility, and, perhaps the most damaging concept of all to the underlying premise of race-based slavery, the belief that all are equal in the sight of

God.[42] Viewing evangelism of their slaves as more likely to erode their authority than to bolster it, British slaveholders in the West Indies, especially in light the Haitian Revolution, became increasingly resistant to slave Christianization and suspicious of the missionaries in their communities. This suspicion would only grow as their message of equality and moral scrutiny met receptive ears.

Legally, the colonial slaveholders were limited in what they could do to stop what they believed to be thinly veiled abolitionism among the missionaries. Missionaries, as the foot-soldiers of a form of state-sponsored Protestantism, were not only encouraged by the British government but were indeed described as early as 1801 as necessary to the maintenance of the empire by homogenizing the increasingly heterogenous ethnic and religious components of the expanding British nation.[43] Therefore, the British missionaries who arrived in the West Indies did so under the protection of the colonial office and imperial law, which not only allowed them to religiously instruct black slaves, but also required slaveholders to allow their slaves to attend religious services.[44] For many slaveholders of the British West Indies, there was no difference between a missionary and an abolitionist. Most British abolitionists of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century were religiously motivated, and that perceived relationship was evident as early as 1791 as mobs of "respectable whites" in Kingston, Jamaica, reacting to the events in Saint Domingue, disrupted missionaries' services and even threatened to

[42] Rugemer, 59.
[43] Hilary M. Carey, *God's Empire: Religion and Colonialism in the British World, C. 1801-1908* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 43.
[44] Ibid, 57.

destroy their chapel.[45] If missionaries preaching to their slaves drew the ire of colonial slaveholders, their conspiratorial suspicions only escalated as the missionaries appointed deacons among the slaves to which they ministered. Not only did this practice elevate the status of certain slaves in their communities as they had been granted spiritual authority, but, as seen in the fact that slave deacons had become leaders of insurrection in Demerara and Jamaica, this status gave them a basis by which to challenge the slaveholders' authority.[46] These conflicts between abolitionist missionaries and colonial slaveholders occurred against the backdrop of the growing abolition movement back in Britain, which succeeded with the Slavery Abolition Act of 1833.

What the historiography of missionaries in the nineteenth century reveals is that the image of missionaries as agents of empire has become contested. While they sometimes, and were perhaps intended by the state to be, a means of spreading economic and cultural imperialism across colonized groups, they could also directly challenge their respective empire's policies as well. While this seems to have been acknowledged in the historiography of missionaries in the Atlantic world during the nineteenth century, this remains largely overlooked for the same group in the early twentieth century. As mentioned earlier, the historiography of U.S. policy in the Caribbean and Latin America during this period is largely dismissive of any significant role of missionaries in these transnational interactions, or merely assumes that they were agents of American capitalism. In both centuries, their role in influencing and challenging great power

[45] Carey, 57-58.
[46] Ibid, 60.

policies in the region was significant, though the dynamics of that role and the level of its impact understandably differed from one empire to the next.

The relationship between missionaries and slaveholders in the French West Indies during the eighteenth century was no less contentious than it was among the British, though it was resolved earlier and quite differently. The missionary/slaveholder feud may have lasted into the nineteenth century as well had it not been for a series of setbacks for French Catholicism in the eighteenth century both at home and abroad. Particularly in Saint Domingue, Jesuits had been recognized for their missionary zeal towards the conversion of black slaves, which naturally put them at odds with the slaveholders of that and other French colonies until the Jesuit Order was suppressed in 1764.[47] However, in spite of the zeal of this particular missionary group towards abolition, abolitionism as a component of the French missionaries' theology appears to have been more limited than it was among their British contemporaries. Rather than directly challenging the institution of slavery, Catholic missionaries within the French empire instead focused on reinforcing the rules already set forth in the French Code Noir regarding the responsibility of slaveowners to provide baptism and religious education to slaves.[48] Beyond that, there appears to have been little emphasis placed on equality before God and slavery as immoral as was the growing sentiment among British Protestant missionaries. Nor was the relationship between Catholic missionaries and the French state as symbiotic as it was

[47] Philippe Delisle, "Bretons in Conquest of a Former Colony: French Catholic Missionaries in Haiti, 1860-1915", in *In God's Empire: French Missionaries and the Modern World*, edited by Owen White and J.P. Daughton. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 67-68.
[48] Sarah Ann Curtis, *Civilizing Habits: Women Missionaries and the Revival of French Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 57-58.

in the British empire. While the French state in the early nineteenth century viewed missionaries as "agents of civilization" and as useful auxiliaries to the state, they were not deemed as essential and the missionaries themselves held ambivalent views of the state in return.[49]

This lukewarm attitude towards the state in the early nineteenth century likely stemmed from what would be another blow to, not just French missionary activity in Saint Domingue and elsewhere, but to the Catholic Church itself. After 1789 when the French Revolution upset the previous order of French society by, among other things, subduing the previous political power the Catholic Church had enjoyed, it also began selling and distributing Church lands throughout French territory and driving French clergy temporarily underground. With less political and financial resources, French missionaries were largely cut off from their previous support networks. The final, if temporary blow to French missionary activities in Saint Domingue came with Haitian independence, when Jean-Jacques Dessalines's program to eliminate the remaining white population in 1804 resulted in most priests fleeing the former colony.[50] With the most zealous missionaries to the slaves gone from the West Indies after 1764, and with no further relationship between the Catholic Church and Haiti until 1860, French missionaries during the period of abolitionist movements did not have the opportunity to become as antagonistic of the slaveholding system in the French West Indies as had been the case in the British islands.

[49] Curtis, 13-14.
[50] Delisle, 68.

That Baptists and the AME were the most active Protestant denominations in Haiti by the time of the U.S. occupation was a direct result of their role in the abolition debate of the previous century. As Protestant missionaries in the British West Indies continued to become more and more of a nuisance to slaveholders in the early nineteenth century, the slaveholders noticed that some denominations were more abolitionist-minded than others. Particularly suspect were missionaries from Methodist and Baptist organizations, whom the slaveholders often accused of inciting slave revolts.[51] Such accusations were not unfounded as the messages preached by British Methodist and Baptist missionaries to the slave populations of the West Indies found common ground with the abolition movement. British Methodist and Baptist societies and missionaries actively protested against slavery in the West Indies believing that it hindered the spread of the Gospel, contradicted the principle of the equality of souls before God, and that the continuation of such sins would ultimately bring down God's wrath upon the empire.[52] As Methodists and Baptists worked to convert slave souls in the British West Indies to Christianity, they believed they were also helping to convert the soul of the Empire to abolition back in London.

Methodist and Baptist missionaries began visiting independent Haiti during the early nineteenth century and, important in shaping the events to come a century later, many of them were Americans. U.S. missionary work in Haiti started as early as 1816 but attempts to establish a permanent missionary presence there would prove to be a

[51] Carey, 44.
[52] Stewart J. Brown, *Providence and Empire: Religion, Politics and Society in the United Kingdom, 1815-1914* (Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2008), 42-43.

challenge throughout the nineteenth century. Responding to a request by the Haitian government for Protestant missionaries, British Methodists and American Quakers were the first denominations to respond. Quakers Stephen Grellet and his friend John Hancock arrived July 16, 1816 in response to President Alexandre Petion's invitation for Grellet to preach at the Roman Catholic Church in Port-au-Prince.[53] While this must have seemed to be a promising start to establishing Protestant activity in Haiti, this mission's initial success would be cut short. After delivering his sermon in Port-au-Prince, Grellet began distributing Bibles to schools as well as individuals before a fever forced him to return to the U.S. early that October.[54]

At the same time, the Wesleyan Methodist Mission of England sent John Brown and James Catts in their own attempt to establish the first permanent Protestant work in Haiti. During this period, political rivalries in Haiti had fractured it into two separate territories, and while U.S. Quakers had answered President Petion's invitation in the south, Brown and Catts had accepted King Henri Christophe's invitation in the north.[55] Exactly why Petion specifically requested an increased Protestant presence is unclear, but the reasoning likely stemmed from the power struggle he was experiencing against his rival, Henri Christophe. According to nineteenth century historian, William Wells Brown, Christophe modeled his rule after Napoleon's empire whereas Petion aspired to be a Washington by promoting republicanism.[56] With that in mind, embracing Protestantism

---

[53] Ivah Heneise, *Pioneers of Light: The Stories of Baptist Witness in Haiti, 1823-1998* (Penney Farms: International Christian Education Fund, 1999), 14-15.
[54] Ibid, 15.
[55] Ibid.
[56] William Wells Brown, *The Black Man: His Antecedents, His Genius, and His Achievements* (New York: Thomas Hamilton, 1863), 172.

was likely another way for Petion to distinguish himself from his rival. Their attempt at establishing a permanent Protestant presence also failed to take hold, but threat of violence rather than disease would be the catalyst. When the two Methodists arrived in 1817, they also met initial success, as their U.S. counterparts, had by capitalizing on growing interest among the Haitian population in both the Bible and in learning English.[57] According to their accounts during their time in Haiti, the challenges they expected to face were not what they experienced once the mission was established. In terms of spiritual challenges, they had expected the principle point of resistance to their message from the population to be related to the practice of vodou, however, their reports suggest that the primary spiritual issues they encountered tended to be more often related to either breaking the Sabbath or the practice of placage (concubinage).[58]

The initial arrival of Protestant missionaries to Haiti, while welcomed by some, was contentious among the larger Haitian population. Despite early public enthusiasm for the missionaries' presence, growing memberships in both northern and southern Haiti, and fewer spiritual issues to contend with than anticipated, what would undo the Methodist mission in Haiti just as it was gaining steam would be a false accusation that erupted into anti-Methodist violence. An incident occurred on November 16, 1818, in which a young man in the Bel Air region of Port-au-Prince murdered his mother by cutting her throat.[59] When he was later questioned by local authorities as to why he committed the murder, the young man listed three reasons: 1) "Because she was a witch,

[57] Heneise, 16.
[58] Ibid.
[52] Leslie Griffiths, *History of Methodism in Haiti* (Port-au-Prince: Imprimerie Methodiste, 1991), 27.

and was going to eat me", 2) "Because she was a diablesse", and 3) "Because it was the will of God".[60] As the questioning continued, the young man's confession shifted admission of guilt to suggestion of conspiracy. When asked who it was that told him that killing his mother was God's will, the young man simply replied, "The ministers".[61]

When confronted about whether he had suggested that the young man should kill his mother as part of God's will, John Brown denied any such conversation took place and described only a passing familiarity with the young man in question. Brown later wrote, "several of the relations of this young man died insane, his mother was deranged during her pregnancy of him, he always appeared simple, was never in the habit of attending preaching, and we had not seen him for a long time".[62] Regardless of the extent to which the young man was affiliated with the Methodist community in Haiti, or the motivations behind his matricide, the damage caused to that community by his confession was extensive. Brown, for his part, was convinced that the murder was a pretext to either control or eradicate the Methodist community in Haiti.[63] Whether this was true or not, the murder caused exactly that. Anti-Methodist violence erupted in Port-au-Prince after news of the murder turned public opinion against them, and the shifting political winds in Haiti left them without a government support base just when they needed it most. In the south, Petion, who had encouraged Protestant missions in Haiti, had just been succeeded by Jean-Pierre Boyer, who suggested that the turmoil could best be resolved if Brown and

[60] Griffiths, 27.
[61] Ibid.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Ibid.

Catts were to leave.[64] It was a major setback for Methodism, and Protestant missionary work in general, throughout Haiti that would be felt for several years before another attempt was made. After Christmas 1818, Brown and Catts returned to England, the Methodist community in the south moved underground to work in secret, and in the north all Protestant work ceased at that time.[65]

This marked a significant turning point in the role of U.S. Protestant missionaries in Haiti, as they replaced their European counterparts to rebuild a Protestant presence there and race became a larger motivating factor. After the U.S. Quaker mission failed to take hold, and the British Methodist mission had been driven out and its local membership driven underground, the confluence of the issues of state, race, and religion would result in another attempt at establishing a permanent Protestant presence in Haiti, this time by African-American Baptists. By 1822, the dust had begun to settle in Port-au-Prince from the anti-Methodist violence of three years prior, and to Baptist minister Thomas Paul the time seemed right to reestablish Protestant missionary work in Haiti. As the question of abolition was increasingly dividing the U.S. north and south, the Boyer Presidency at that time was encouraging African-Americans to immigrate to Haiti in the hopes that, in exchange for a new home for people of African descent where the question of abolition had already been resolved, they would bring with them American skillsets that would aid Haitian development. Paul accepted this invitation as an opportunity to not

[64] Heneise, 17-18.
[65] Ibid, 18.

only reestablish a Protestant presence in Haiti, but also to establish transnational ties of faith between people of African descent.

Born in Exeter, New Hampshire in 1773 to free parents, Paul learned to read and write at a very early age.[66] These skills quickly caught the attention of others, as his impressive knowledge of the Bible led him into the ministry early on. Before attempting to bring Baptist teachings to Haiti, Paul's early ministry had already been successful in breaching social and racial barriers by working with white Baptist communities to pioneer and establish Black Baptist churches in the U.S. Northeast.[67] As the new nation of Haiti continued to fuel the U.S. debates over abolition in the early nineteenth century, Paul was one of many African-Americans with an interest in seeing the world's first black republic prosper. Believing that a greater knowledge of the Gospel was essential to the new nation's success, Paul submitted his proposal to the Massachusetts Baptist Missionary Society in 1823 to allow him to travel to Haiti for six months to discern whether the Haitian population would be open to evangelism.[68] The mission was approved, and Paul set out the following year to bring Protestantism to a land that had forced it into hiding just a few years earlier. Under the auspices of providing English instruction for the Haitian population, and wishing to evaluate their spiritual condition, Paul arrived in Port-au-Prince on July 4, 1823 and arranged a meeting with President Boyer for July 15.[69] The meeting concluded as a major success, not only for the future of

[66] Heneise, 22.
[67] Ibid, 24.
[68] Philip Everhard, *History of the American Baptist African and Haytien Missions: For the Use of Sabbath Schools* (Boston: Massachusetts Sabbath School Union, 1831), 57.
[69] Heneise, 25.

a Baptist mission in Haiti but also for other Protestant missionaries who had been forced underground. Boyer was convinced of the need of the mission and to provide government support and protection to missionaries, thereby allowing the preexisting Methodist population to resume public work as well.[70]

Although this mission was deemed a success by both the Massachusetts Baptist Missionary Society and by Haitian Protestants who were once again able to practice their faith openly, the Baptist mission did not continue beyond its initial six-month scope. After the mission concluded on Christmas Day, 1823, Paul returned to the U.S., calling on other missionaries to pick up the torch and establish a permanent Baptist mission in a place he had concluded was ready for the Christian message, but died on April 14, 1831 without anyone yet having taken up his call.[71] Though his mission may not have resulted in inspiring a long-term Baptist mission to Haiti in his lifetime, it is important not to undervalue the contribution Thomas Paul made in the spiritual inroads he helped forge both at home and abroad. A leading figure in the founding of some of New England's first black churches, he did so by using the spiritual connections between white and black Baptists to overshadow the racial divisions that otherwise may have hindered inter-Baptist cooperation. In Haiti too, Paul may have only had preliminary success in determining the potential for some future Baptist missionary to turn his short-term mission into a long-term presence, but his largest, long-term success was one shared across national and denominational lines. In one meeting, Paul was able to lay the

[70] Heneise, 25-26.
[71] Ibid, 28.

groundwork for future U.S. Baptists while also making it possible for the converts of British Methodists to once again come out into the light of day.

To understand the relationship that missionaries L. Ton Evans and S.E. Churchstone Lord had as intermediaries between Haiti and the United States in the early twentieth century, it is important to understand Thomas Paul's role as the forerunner of the U.S. missionary status in Haiti. Already having forged relationships across racial divides in New England, Paul managed during his brief time in Haiti to build bridges that neither financial or political actors had managed to build. Based on his accomplishments in New England, Paul was able to make political inroads into Haiti early on thanks to several influential merchants in New York who, being supportive of Paul's work, supplied him with letters of introduction to Haiti's ruling elite.[72] This no doubt helped facilitate his meeting with President Boyer. The fact that Paul came away from the meeting with full government endorsement and protection to preach, as well as expressed hope by Boyer that "the time was not very remote, when public sentiment would authorize the building of houses for Christian worship, after the customs of America, without fear of molestation", shows the first instance of a U.S. missionary impacting political policy in Haiti.[73] Therefore, what Evans and Lord would do in challenging political policy in Haiti, though at that time against U.S. policy, was not a historical anomaly, but part of a tradition of U.S. missionaries behaving as a go-between for citizens, governments, and businessmen started by Thomas Paul. This event also

[72] Everhard, 57.
[73] Ibid, 59.

demonstrates the value of exploring missionary history as an aspect of foreign policy history, as it was a U.S. Baptist missionary who was able to negotiate with a Haitian head of state regarding policies that impacted Americans (and other Protestant missionaries) in Haiti at a time when the U.S. and Haiti had no formal diplomatic relations.

Though Thomas Paul did not live to see his work bear fruit in the form of a permanent Baptist presence in Haiti, his call did not go unanswered forever. The torch was taken up by another African-American Baptist, William C. Monroe, who was convinced of the need to bring Protestant Christianity to the Haitian people. In 1835, Monroe petitioned the Board of Managers of the Baptist General Commission to become a missionary to Haiti, to which the Commission granted him a one-year appointment.[74] Despite the initial successes of Monroe's mission, which continued for three years instead of the original one-year appointment, his mission, too, was cut short, this time due to financial constraints and personal tragedy. By 1837, the Board that had sponsored Monroe was experiencing increased financial difficulties. That, along with the death of his wife, forced Monroe to turn in his resignation and return to the U.S. in March 1838.[75] This setback, however, proved temporary as Monroe's work not only inspired other Protestants to come to Haiti, such as James Theodore Holly who would become the first U.S. Episcopal Bishop of Haiti, but also inspired fellow Baptists to pick up the torch and establish a permanent Baptist presence in Haiti starting in 1843.

[74] Heneise, 29.
[75] Ibid, 30-31.

The eventual success of the Baptist goal for permanent missionary work in Haiti that was accomplished in 1843 was the result of combined and coordinated efforts between independent U.S. Baptists, British Baptists, and the newly formed American Baptist Free Mission Society (ABFMS). While the question of abolition had already been answered in Britain ten years prior, the United States in the 1840s was still being torn apart over the issue, and U.S. Baptists were likewise torn between North and South. Dissatisfied with the U.S. Baptist denomination's refusal to take a clear and unified stance on the issue of slavery, Baptist abolitionists formed the ABFMS with the specific purpose of catering to what they saw as the spiritual and educational needs of the Black race.[76] That the new organization's goals specifically looked to work in Haiti as the key to racial and spiritual uplift can be found in their formal declaration:

> Let only the schoolmaster and the minister be put abroad in every district and neighborhood of Haiti, and her elevation will soon be observable. She shall then be known and read of all men as an epistle of God to the nations, teaching them whereto lies the real dignity of the human soul, that it is not any certain complexion or features, but is the development of one's intellectual powers and purification of one's moral nature.[77]

For the Baptists that established a permanent presence in Haiti during the mid-nineteenth century, education and evangelism went hand in hand in uplifting the Haitian people by giving them the tools they needed to prove to the rest of the world the ability of Blacks to self-govern.

[76] Heneise, 34-35.
[77] Ibid, 35.

While the Baptist presence in Haiti did remain after 1843, its success ebbed and flowed through the remainder of the nineteenth century. Significant changes in the United States shifted, but did not resolve, the issue of race, and events in Haiti would chronically threaten whatever gains U.S. missionaries made in Haitian communities. As the nineteenth century gave way to the twentieth, internal politics of both the United States and Haiti went through dramatic shifts thereby changing the relationship between the two nations. Whatever Haiti meant to the United States in terms of the continued institution of slavery was no longer a question after 1865, but, as the United States shifted at the turn of the century from a regional to a global power, where Haiti fit into the U.S.'s continued expansion of influence and strategic concerns became the new question. Even though slavery in the United States had ended, race still remained a factor in how the United States and Haiti interacted with each other. U.S. expansion and Haitian instability from this point would put the two nations on a collision course, and U.S. missionaries in Haiti would find themselves caught in the middle.

CHAPTER III

THE ROAD TO JULY 1915: HOW AMERICAN BUSINESS, POLITICAL, AND MISSIONARY INTERESTS IN HAITI CONVERGED TOWARD INTERVENTION

The role of Baptist and AME missionaries in shaping the U.S. occupation of Haiti in the early twentieth century was not a departure from their past roles, but an evolution of the preexisting relationship that the missionaries believed they had with the Haitian people. While the resistance to U.S. policy on Haiti's behalf was new to the period of the occupation, the belief that it was the role of these missionaries to advocate for what they believed to be improvements in the lives of the Haitian public gave precedent to their later role. Therefore, to understand the role that U.S. missionaries would play in shaping the U.S. administration of the occupation what their role had been in the previous century must be understood as well. In the previous chapter, the political, racial, and religious interaction between the United States and Haiti was explored as well as the early interactions between U.S. missionaries and Haiti. As the interaction between the missionaries, Haiti, and the United States was influenced by the abolition debate in the U.S. during the first half of the nineteenth century, debates in the U.S. over black self-governance influenced this interaction in the second half. As U.S. missionaries of the late nineteenth century devoted themselves to providing what they felt the Haitians needed to

achieve a stable and prosperous nation, they set themselves up for their later role of directly protesting U.S. policy in Haiti and shifting U.S. public opinion against that policy.

For both U.S. missionaries and the United States government, the mid-nineteenth century marked a significant turning point in their relationship with Haiti. Both established a permanent presence in the Caribbean nation at this time, and yet the political and religious footholds they gained remained contentious and often threatened through the late nineteenth century. As the nineteenth century gave way to the twentieth, the relationship of American politicians, businessmen, and missionaries with Haiti would shift again as the United States began expanding its territory and influence overseas. While the question of slavery had been answered decades before, race continued to shape how the United States viewed itself in contrast to neighboring, non-white populations who fell under the U.S.'s growing sphere of influence. Furthermore, escalating tensions in Europe in the early twentieth century accelerated the U.S.'s rise as a military power, thereby affecting its relationship with its neighbors, including Haiti.

Establishing Missionary Goals in Haiti

The second half of the nineteenth century is crucial to our understanding of how U.S. missionaries established their role as significant actors in U.S. foreign policy towards Haiti, and how Haiti became a fixture of U.S. policy in the region. It is during this period when the issue of race, having guided the relationship between the two countries since Haitian independence, shifted in its focus, but not in its significance. With the debate of abolitionism settled, the role of U.S. missionaries to Haiti became one of

advocating for self-determination for people of African descent. Likewise, for U.S. foreign policy towards Haiti, the elimination of the institution of slavery within the United States removed the threat of Haiti as ideological catalyst for slave uprisings, but its existence still pressed the question of black self-determination in a time when the U.S. was struggling with the implications of full citizenship for African-Americans. African-American missionaries for both the Baptist and AME denominations continued to advocate for evangelism and education in Haiti on the belief that helping Haiti to become prosperous would provide an international example of the efficacy of black self-governance. With the precedent having been set by Thomas Paul, these missionaries became more than just spiritual advisors and humanitarian aid workers and established themselves as intermediaries between the governments and political, racial, spiritual and economic organizations of Haiti and the United States.

Despite the difficulties of establishing a presence during the early nineteenth century, U.S. missionaries had by mid-century managed to make significant inroads to becoming a permanent fixture in Haiti. U.S. Baptists had made it possible for themselves and Methodists to operate openly in Haiti after years of persecution. Though the Baptists themselves were having difficulty finding volunteers to continue the mission before 1843, the work of forerunners like Paul and Monroe inspired African-Americans within other denominations to pursue missions in Haiti. One such example is how shortly after Boyer had promised safety for American Protestant missionaries to operate in Haiti the African Methodist Episcopal Church began to develop a presence there. First founded by Bishop Richard Allen in 1816 as the first Protestant denomination founded by African-

Americans, the AME Church began with the goal of racial uplift as a core component of its spiritual objectives.[1] The goals of both the AME Church and the Republic of Haiti easily aligned, sparking early interest by the denomination in establishing a missionary presence there. As Rev. Daniel Payne of the AME recounted in his history of the Church to 1888:

> To aid in making the Haytian nationality and government strong, powerful and commanding ought to be the desire and the aim of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. As the Haytians have completely thrown off the white man's yoke in their national affairs, so have the leaders and members of the A.M.E. Church in ecclesiastical affairs. As the Haytians have been endeavoring to demonstrate the ability of the Negro for self-government during a period of eighty-four years, so also have the leaders of the A.M.E. Church been endeavoring to demonstrate the ability of the Negro for self-government for seventy-two years.[2]

While individuals and organizations within denominations like the Baptists argued to prioritize Haiti as a mission field, no other denomination as a whole had as vested an interest in Haiti's national success as did the AME.

Much like their Baptist counterparts, the AME attempts to establish a permanent presence in Haiti met with difficulty. The first missionary appointed to the Haiti mission field was Scipio Beanes in 1826. Benefiting from Thomas Paul's success in opening Haiti back up to Protestant missions just three years earlier, Scipio Beanes opted to become the AME missionary in Port-au-Prince for both the purpose of evangelizing to native Haitians and African-American emigres, and for health reasons as his doctor

[1] Daniel A. Payne, *History of the African Methodist Episcopal Church* (1891, repr., New York: Arno Press and The New York Times, 1969), 3.
[2] Ibid, 477.

recommended a warm climate to help him recover from a pulmonary affliction.[3] Despite his early successes, Beanes' work in Haiti was temporary and sporadic. Initial improvement in his health allowed him to be effective in raising the number of church members in Haiti from 72 to 182 as he traveled back and forth from Haiti and the U.S. from 1826 until his death in 1835.[4] Other AME missionaries followed throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, but each attempt also proved temporary. Nevertheless, the work begun by the AME Church in Haiti at this time is significant as it established important transnational links between Haitians and African-Americans. While AME missionaries do not appear to have established the political connections at this time that the Baptists had with the Haitian government, they established links between African-American religious organizations and Haitian converts that developed further in the twentieth century.

Another figure who was inspired by Thomas Paul's achievements, but utilized his missionary status to establish more direct political connections in Haiti, is James Theodore Holly, who became both the first African-American to be ordained a bishop by the Episcopal Church and the first missionary bishop of that Church in Haiti. After being approved by the Church's Foreign Committee to visit Haiti, Holly arrived in Port-au-Prince on July 31, 1855 and spent that August collecting information about the area and preaching in the city's Methodist and Baptist chapels.[5] This indicates that by this time

[3] Payne, 105.
[4] Ibid, 105-106.
[5] James Theodore Holly, *Facts About the Church Mission in Haiti: A Concise Statement by Bishop Holly* (New York: Thomas Whitaker 2&3 Bible House, 1897), 2/10.

there was a strong level of interdenominational connectivity and support among U.S. missionaries and that houses of worship were operating in the open. Furthermore, his stated motives for pursuing Haiti as a mission field echo the same sentiments of racial uplift as those stated by the AME Church. In his 1860 treatise, *A Vindication of the Capacity of the Negro Race*, Holly described what he believed was at stake at ensuring Haiti's future prosperity:

> If one powerful and civilized negro sovereignty can be developed to the summit of national grandeur in the West Indies, where the keys to the commerce of both hemispheres can be held; this fact will solve all questions respecting the negro, whether they be slavery, prejudice or proscription, and wheresoever on the face of the globe such questions shall present themselves for a satisfactory solution.[6]

Among Baptist, AME, and Episcopal missionaries to Haiti during the nineteenth century there was agreement that the fate of Haiti would ultimately be shared with the entirety of the black race.

After completing his assignment and reporting back to the Episcopal Church on the conditions in Haiti, the Church authorized Holly to establish a permanent presence there as their missionary bishop, and thereby the Church's main representative there. Holly's account of his return to Haiti in 1861 reveals that the relationship between the Haitian government and U.S. missionaries had progressed significantly since Thomas Paul's meeting with President Boyer in 1823. At the time of Holly's journey in 1861, then President Fabre Geffrard had resumed the earlier government policy of inviting

[6] James Theodore Holly, "A Vindication of the Capacity of the Negro Race for Self-Government and Civilized Progress," in *Black Separatism and the Caribbean 1860*, ed. Howard H. Bell (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1970), 66.

African-Americans to emigrate to Haiti. Listed as a pastor accepting that invitation, he traveled with commendatory letters by the Bishop of Connecticut addressed to the Haitian President for Holly's recognition as their resident bishop.[7] By the time of Holly's arrival, it is clear that the President was favorable to the new bishop. Two days after his arrival in Port-au-Prince, Holly performed his first ministerial act by baptizing a child who had been born aboard the same ship during the passage to Haiti, within the National Palace and with President Geffrard and his wife standing as godfather and godmother to the child.[8] Further evidence of the Haitian government's amicable reception of Holly, and of the African-American emigres that travelled alongside him is the fact that all of them were settled on the President's personal habitation located three miles outside the capital, with the President's private mansion being placed at Holly's disposal for holding Sunday services.[9]

The account of Bishop Holly's two journeys to Haiti, and the reception he received, demonstrates an important change in the status and role of U.S. missionaries, not only in how they interacted with each other but also and especially with the Haitian government. Holly's immediate connections with the existing Baptist and Methodist communities in the Haitian capital show that, by the mid-nineteenth century, interdenominational cooperation was encouraged. Baptist missionary Thomas Paul's 1823 appeal to allow Methodists to operate in Haiti, as well as Holly's own story as the first Episcopal missionary bishop to Haiti, who had been inspired by the earlier work of

[7] Holly, *Facts About the Church Mission in Haiti*, 3/10.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Ibid.

Baptist missionary William C. Monroe, are a testament to that. The stories of Paul, Thomas, and Holly also demonstrate racial uplift as a vital component of this interdenominational cooperation, as these three African-Americans pioneered American Protestant missionary activity in Haiti. By working across denominations to achieve the same goal of improving Haitian society through spiritual guidance, they were working towards their mutual larger goal of transnationally uplifting the black race. The success or failure of the first Black Republic was still a prominent issue for African-Americans as proof on the international stage of their ability to self-govern.

President Geffrard's exceedingly warm welcome of Holly demonstrates that the relationship between U.S. missionaries and the Haitian government had by 1861 grown beyond merely being amiable to their presence into one of direct cooperation. One could view this welcoming attitude by the Haitian government as merely an extension of the fact that the government had, after all, invited African-Americans to emigrate there, but President Geffrard's actions as described in Holly's account are much more personal and direct than just overseeing successful state policy. Geffrard's decisions to stand with his wife as godparents to a newly born, newly arrived African-American immigrant in a ceremony performed by an African-American missionary at the National Palace, and then to offer his private mansion for future worship services, are nothing less than the head of state directly and personally endorsing a U.S. missionary presence in Haiti. By doing so, Geffrard demonstrated a vested interest in how cooperation between the Haitian state and African-American missionaries could enhance the status of peoples of African descent throughout the western hemisphere.

This demonstrates that, even decades prior to the U.S. intervention in Haiti, U.S. missionaries were already serving a significant role in Haitian-U.S. relations that only developed further into the early twentieth century. At a time in which there were no official diplomatic channels between the United States and Haiti, U.S. missionaries (and specifically African-American missionaries) were serving as points of contact and coordination between Americans and the Haitian government. This is an important aspect of the history of U.S. and Haitian interaction that has been otherwise been overlooked by not placing greater value on the role of U.S. missionaries in our understanding of U.S. foreign policy in the region. Official U.S. diplomatic recognition of Haiti soon followed, but the changes that took place in U.S. foreign policy at that time, while parallel to the increasing role of U.S. missionaries in Haitian affairs, meant the overlap in their respective goals were not always consistent. Just as conditions between U.S. missionaries and Haiti changed dramatically by the 1860s, so, too, did the relationship between the U.S. government and Haiti as the question of slavery in the U.S. would finally demand an answer.

The U.S. Civil War and U.S.-Haitian Relations

As the role of U.S. missionaries in Haiti changed dramatically during the nineteenth century, so too did the relationship between the United States government and Haiti. These changes are important to understand because what happened in the U.S. at this time, and how it came to terms with the question of slavery changed the scope of the missionaries serving in Haiti. Prior to the U.S. Civil War, the interactions between U.S. missionaries to Haiti, and the governments of the U.S. and Haiti, were guided by the U.S.

debate on abolition. After the war ended, and slavery was abolished in the U.S., this interaction changed. To understand how it changed, we must first examine how the U.S. struggled with the question of slavery and how these struggles shifted its relationship with Haiti.

Geffrard's interest in direct cooperation with African-American missionaries to Haiti can be understood as part of his larger interest in the growing abolitionist movement in the United States. His resumption of earlier attempts by Haiti to entice a larger wave of African-American emigration in general was pursued in the hopes that Haiti would get the skills and manpower needed to support his development projects, and in return fellow members of the black race would gain a level of freedom and security that was not available to them in the United States. Geffrard's development projects included a fleet of steamboats to better conduct international commerce, waterworks construction and gas lighting for the capital of Port-au-Prince, a national foundry, and an overhaul of the Haitian education system.[10] It was an ambitious set of projects, which Geffrard knew would need a sharp increase in agricultural production to support. For that, Haiti needed an influx of skilled agricultural laborers, and so the Haitian government appealed to African-Americans to come to Haiti with the promise of freedom and the right to buy fertile land on either private or public estates at a reasonable price.[11]

This particular emigration program is relevant to understanding the evolving relationship between Haiti, the United States, and U.S. missionaries because it was

[10] Leon D. Pamphile, *Haitians and African Americans: A Heritage of Tragedy and Hope* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001), 50.
[11] Ibid, 50-51.

developed and implemented via coordination between the Haitian government, American abolitionists, and Bishop Holly. Believing that Haiti's uplift and racial uplift would go hand in hand if the Black Republic proved to the world they could bring prosperity to themselves, Holly partnered with general agent of the Haytian Bureau of Emigration, Scottish abolitionist, and friend of famed American abolitionist John Brown, James Redpath in order to carry out the project.[12] While Redpath worked with the Haitian government to appeal to African-Americans, Holly was an intermediary between Haiti's emigration program and members of the U.S. government who supported African-American emigration. When Missouri congressman, Francis Preston Blair, proposed that free blacks should colonize Central and South America in 1858, Holly wrote to Blair to inquire more about the plan, and to suggest that Haiti was ready and willing to receive said emigrants.[13] This demonstrates that as early as the mid-nineteenth century, U.S. missionaries in Haiti were not only working towards the spiritual uplift of the Haitian people, but were also working to transnationally elevate peoples of African descent and were even serving in unofficial diplomatic roles between the governments of Haiti and the United States. As the United States had no official diplomatic representation in Haiti in 1858, U.S. missionaries at that time were among the few lines of communication between the two nations.

The African-American emigration efforts, while supported by these missionary-facilitated transnational links between the United States and Haiti, nevertheless struggled

[12] Pamphile, 51.
[13] Ibid.

as the racial symbol of Haiti conflicted with the reality of Haiti. In spite of the hopeful view of Haiti by African-Americans as "The Black Republic", showing all the world the proof of black self-determination, Haitian independence did not necessarily produce a nation of racial equality. There still existed a racial divide between mulattos, who continued to hold elite status in Haitian society, and the overwhelmingly black majority. While these two groups had tentatively worked together at the beginning of the Haitian Revolution, their goals rarely coincided. Though united in wanting to challenge the white planter class in 1791, the mulatto and free people of color were more interested in achieving equal status with the planter class rather than abolishing slavery altogether. After independence, this minority group would still hold more elite positions in Haitian society that continued to put them at odds with the majority. These transnational links would later be strained as African-Americans who traveled to Haiti found that the racial divides that they had hoped to leave behind in the U.S. were not entirely absent in Haiti.

Events in the United States both domestically and internationally soon forced the country to diplomatically acknowledge the Haitian Republic as the question of American slavery finally demanded resolution. In early 1861, while the United States began to break apart as North and South prepared for war, events in the Dominican Republic threatened to bring the entire island of Hispaniola once again under the control of Spain. Much like its neighbor, the early Dominican Republic struggled with political instability and preexisting tensions with Haiti resulting in the Dominican President offering annexation of the newly independent country back to Spain. For the Haitians, fear of the return of a European power back to the island of Hispanola resulted in Haitian support for

anti-Spanish resistance groups in the Dominican Republic. *The Christian Recorder* (*CR*), which was the newspaper of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, records that the presence of Spanish power on the island caused anxiety among the Haitian population over the possibility that Spain might try to extend its influence to the Haitian side with an old enemy's blessing. In an article dated April 6, 1861, the *CR* reported that "A large naval and military force of ten thousand is said to be on the way from Spain to Cuba. It is said that Hayti will soon share the same fate as San Domingo, with the consent of France".[14] As Haiti was still struggling to repay the indemnity forced upon it by France, it is understandable that such rumors would begin circulating.

The United States, which began its own major internal conflict just days after the *CR* report, took notice of the events in Hispaniola and saw the cost of withholding a diplomatic presence from the island. The events in the Dominican Republic, by U.S. reasoning, were in direct violation of the Monroe Doctrine, which had been the prevailing ideology behind U.S. foreign policy in the Americas since 1823, that viewed any intervention by a European power in the nations of the Americas as a potential threat to the United States and its interests. Though certainly in no shape in 1861 to involve itself in a foreign conflict as the U.S. Civil War began its first year, the United States nevertheless took steps to have greater diplomatic engagement in Hispaniola. Along with diplomatically recognizing the Dominican Republic in 1861, by 1862 the U.S. Senate was debating the diplomatic recognition of both Haiti and Liberia. The reasons why the

[14] Elisha Weaver, "Spain and San Domingo. – Much Excitement Prevailed in Havana," *The Christian Recorder*, April 6, 1861, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.

U.S. government finally began considering reversing its policy of diplomatic isolation of Haiti in 1862 include, but were by no means limited to, the Spanish threat to the Monroe Doctrine from the previous year. Massachusetts Senator Charles Sumner supported diplomatic recognition of Haiti. In his speech to the U.S Senate on April 23 and 24, 1862, Senator Sumner appeals for Haiti's official recognition by pointing out their shared history of celebrating independence in the Americas:

> Of the many colonies who, following our example, have declared their independence, Hayti was the first; and yet, by a strange perversity, it is not yet recognized by our Government. We are told that the last shall be first and the first shall be last. This surely is a case where the first is last. But it remains to be seen if, under the genial influence of such a recognition, Hayti may not become, among all independent colonies, first in importance to us, as it was first in following our example.[15]

Any of the missionaries who might have read this speech would no doubt have appreciated the biblical reference in describing Haiti's status.

As the bill moved on to debate in the Senate, there was little doubt of its passing, however, Kentucky Senator Garrett Davis proposed an amendment. Davis did not object to Haiti's official recognition per se, but he objected to the possibility of black diplomats from Haiti being granted equal standing at all diplomatic functions with their white counterparts.[16] Davis proposed to amend the bill so that representation between the U.S. and Haiti, as well as Liberia, would consist of a lesser status. He suggested that consuls, rather than diplomatic agents, provide representation as consuls have no diplomatic

[15] Charles Sumner, *The Bill to Authorize the Appointment of Diplomatic Representatives to the Republics of Hayti and Liberia* (Washington: The Congressional Globe Office, 1862), 6.
[16] Ibid, 10.

privileges of exemption, but are still recognized as officers of a foreign state and are under special protection of the law of nations.[17] Sumner rejected the amendment, as did a clear majority of the Senate, with a vote of 8 in favor and 30 opposed. This was followed by a vote of 32 in favor and 7 opposed that officially recognized the Republic of Haiti.[18]

Aside from the racial attitudes that persisted in how Senator Davis viewed the U.S. relationship with Haiti, his arguments in the course of the debated amendment reveal that he considered Haiti's recognition important to U.S. interests in the hemisphere. In reference to the possibility of Spain retaking the Dominican Republic, Davis proclaimed:

> Now, Mr. President, I am friendly to both of these infant negro republics (Haiti and Liberia). Both of them are, to a greater or less extent, mixed. I see it announced in the papers this morning that England has brought over Spain to her view in relation to the attack on Mexico, by promising not to interfere in the enterprise of Spain in the reconquest and subjugation of the whole island of San Domingo. In such a controversy my sympathies would be with the negro against Spain.[19]

This is an interesting stance on Davis' part because it reveals that, even among the most vocal dissenters of Haiti's full diplomatic recognition, maintaining the policy of the Monroe Doctrine superseded concerns over granting racial equality. As the U.S. government moved toward emancipation, the European powers were now considered to be a greater threat to American interests in the region than independent blacks.

---

[17] Sumner, *The Bill to Authorize the Appointment of Diplomatic Representatives to the Republics of Hayti and Liberia*, 11-12.
[18] Ibid, 14.
[19] Ibid, 10.

As the United States entered its Civil War and subsequently opened diplomatic channels with Haiti, the debate within the African-American community over the question of emigration to Haiti was reignited. While Bishop Holly and others saw opportunities for African-Americans in Haiti that were denied to those remaining in the United States, others viewed the emigration plan with much greater cynicism. During an anti-Haitian emigration meeting held in Philadelphia on May 25, 1861, the AME *Christian Recorder* reported that the stance taken was "That we firmly, uncompromisingly oppose, condemn and denounce as unfair and unjust, as unwise and as unchristian, the fleeing, colonizing efforts urged by James Redpath, the white, seconded by George Lawrence, Jr., the black, who is employed by him".[20] This sentiment was echoed in another such meeting several months later, which clarified that the general concern was less about the idea of "fleeing" from the problems they faced in the war-torn U.S. and more about concerns that the emigration plan was nothing more than a scheme to rid the U.S. of free blacks. On November 30, 1861, another *CR* report on opposition to Haitian emigration within the African American community of Boston conveyed the belief that:

> The sole object of the Colonization scheme, primitively, was to rid this country of free persons of color as fast as they become liberated from bondage, so that they may not be in the way of slaves, nor white race. The Haytien scheme has for its sole object the making of money – so you see, while prejudice, with a few other things, underlie the one, money-making underlies the motives for the other.[21]

[20] Elisha Weaver, "Anti-Haytien Immigration Meeting," *The Christian Recorder*, May 25, 1861, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.
[21] T. Strother, "Opposition to Haytien Emigration," *The Christian Recorder*, November 30, 1861, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.

The prevailing assumption among the African-American community by the early 1860s was that the "Haytien scheme" was nothing more than a plan to remove them from the U.S. so that the American population would only consist of free whites and enslaved blacks.

As the U.S. Civil War entered its second year, the idea for most African-Americans of relocating to Haiti only became more unpalatable, and perhaps no longer even necessary. On July 5, 1862, an article submitted to the *CR* by AME minister and medical doctor, Reverend W.R. Revels, laid out eight points of objection to the idea of African American relocation to Haiti; 1) The plan pandered to anti-black racism by insisting on white Haitian representation in Washington, and placing James Redpath as the American consul, 2) The debate over relocation was creating discord within the African American community, 3) The Press was further inflaming this discord by exaggerating the number of African Americans who had chosen to emigrate, 4) That the stated motives of those who supported the plan changed too often to be trusted, 5) That the current war was already beginning to ebb away at continued existence of the institution of slavery, 6) That African Americans had something to contribute to American civilization, 7) That cultural, political, linguistic, religious, and even environmental differences between Haitians and African Americans made the two groups incompatible, and 8) That Haiti's ongoing internal conflicts between the mulatto elite minority and the majority black population made it little better as an option for African

Americans.[22] Along with a distrust of those supporting the plan, these objections echo the concerns that limited African-American emigration earlier in the nineteenth century. Ultimately, in spite of the visions of those such as President Geffrard of transnational black unity, many free African-Americans in the 1860s viewed themselves as too different and distinct from Haitian society and climate to successfully integrate, as a growing part of U.S. society as Union victories in the war paved the way for potential new opportunities for them, and as possible emigrants who would simply be trading one set of national race issues for another.

Within the U.S. government, Sumner was among the skeptics concerning any attempt at establishing a colony of African-Americans overseas. In a private letter dated October 28, 1862, Sumner confessed "The Colonization delusion is from Montgomery Blair, Post-Master Genl, who has made a convert of the President. But thus far I have thought it best to allow it to have a free course & thus to avoid a difference with the President".[23] While Sumner was not interested in pursuing the issue at a time when his primary focus was the Emancipation Proclamation, and the nation was in the second year of the U.S. Civil War, further correspondence in the months following the end of the war reveal that Sumner's views on the matter had only grown more negative with time. On August 28, 1865, Sumner wrote unequivocally, "Let me also protest against the whole suggestion of Colonization, as disastrous. We cannot spare the labor of the ex-slave. He

[22] Rev. W.R. Revels, "Eight Reasons for Objecting to the Haytien Scheme," *The Christian Recorder*, July 5, 1862, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.
[23] Charles Sumner, *The Selected Letters of Charles Sumner*, Volume 2: 1859-1874, ed. Beverly Wilson Palmer (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1990), 128.

is needed."[24] Though Sumner by 1865 considered the idea of relocating freed African-Americans overseas as a potential disaster for the United States, a failed experiment by Lincoln in 1863 would reveal how disastrous it could be for the African-Americans themselves.

With President Lincoln having been convinced of African-American colonization as a potential solution to the racial tensions emancipation could bring, between 1863-1864 he pursued one of the most ambitious attempts at encouraging African-American emigration when he convinced the U.S. government and nearly 500 former slaves to establish a colony on L'Ile de Vache off the coast of southwest Haiti. In 1862, due to efforts on Lincoln's part, the U.S. House of Representatives created the Select Committee on Emancipation and Colonization with the purpose of determining if and where free African-Americans could be relocated.[25] The timing of the formation of this Committee coincided with the United States vote to diplomatically recognize Liberia and Haiti; both places were considered as viable options for colonization. They reasoned, though apparently without considering earlier African-American emigration experiences, that the climate and topography of these two independent Black nations would be ideal for African-Americans to settle, but that Liberia would be too costly.[26] That left Haiti as the best option in the eyes of the Committee. However, poor planning and poor judgment on Lincoln's part doomed the venture.

---

[24] Sumner, *The Selected Letters of Charles Sumner*, 329.
[25] James D. Lockett, "Abraham Lincoln and Colonization: An Episode That Ends in Tragedy at L'Ile de Vache, Haiti, 1863-1864," *Journal of Black Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 4, (June, 1991): 431.
[26] Ibid, 432.

After appealing to and convincing some African-Americans to become colonists, Lincoln contracted Wall Street investment brokers Paul S. Forbes and Charles K. Tuckerman to carry out the colonization effort, who proceeded without adequately supplying the colony nor even obtaining an agreement from the Haitian government to allow a colony in their territory.[27] The same problems that earlier emigrants had faced were repeated, such as problems with climate, language, and cultural transition, were compounded by the Haitian government's response to what it interpreted as an invasion of its territory. The state of the colony by 1864, in disarray and under harassment by Haitian soldiers, forced the United States to return the colonists to U.S. soil, and the abandonment of a colonization program for which Congress had appropriated $600,000 led to the passing of an act that prevented any future government attempts to establish African-American colonies overseas.[28]

These radical changes in U.S. foreign policy towards Haiti, from one of isolation to direct interaction, are important for several reasons. Foremost, it meant that U.S. missionaries had to navigate their interactions with Haitians and the Haitian government differently now that the U.S. government was actively engaged with Haiti. U.S. missionaries, while interacting in a different way with Haiti, were no longer the closest thing to an official intermediary between the two nations. In some ways, this had potential to make U.S. missionaries and the U.S. government partners in building up Haiti, but as we shall see it also put them in conflict when their respective goals for Haiti

[27] Lockett, 438.
[28] Ibid, 441.

did not align. Furthermore, the goal of establishing official diplomatic relations with Haiti, and by attempting to emigrate African-Americans there, shows that the United States by the 1860s ceased to view Haiti as a potential problem in the U.S. questions regarding race and viewed it as possible solution. All the way from Lincoln's administration to that of Wilson's, Haiti from that point was viewed by U.S. foreign policy as potentially beneficial and problematic to its goals. While this study focuses on the role of U.S. missionaries in U.S. policy towards Haiti, and not of U.S. businessmen whom have garnered more attention in the historiography, there is a consistent lesson about their role that is worth mentioning. Lincoln made a mistake entrusting U.S. businessmen to inform his intended goals towards Haiti, and yet Woodrow Wilson's administration repeated this mistake to a degree in 1915.

The Question of Dominican Annexation

After the U.S. Civil War concluded in 1865, the relationship between the United States, Haiti, and the U.S. missionaries that worked between them had been radically altered. By this time, Spain's attempt to annex the Dominican Republic, along with fears of taking Haiti with it, had failed. With the war over and slavery abolished in the United States, the U.S. government began reasserting its power in the Caribbean and Latin America. The question of emigration out of the United States began to fizzle out as African-Americans began to work towards new roles in post-war U.S. society. Missionaries in Haiti continued their work to uplift the Haitian people in hopes of proving to the world, as well as their newly emancipated neighbors, that free blacks were capable of self-government and creating their own prosperity. By the end of the 1860s, a

plan by U.S. President Grant presented the possibility for more direct coordination between Haitians and African-Americans for mutual racial uplift.

By 1869, the government of the Dominican Republic was once again offering itself to be annexed as a territory under the rule of a foreign power. Only this time, the foreign power in question was not Spain or some other potential violator of the Monroe Doctrine, but the United States. As the Dominican Republic once again came under the control of President Buenaventura Baez in 1868, he repeated his earlier offer to Spain of annexation the following year but this time to President Grant. Interested in the offer, Grant embraced the project of admitting the Dominican Republic as a territory of the United States. As had been the case with the possibility of Spanish annexation years earlier, the fate of neighboring Haiti again came into question. Some in the AME community welcomed the possibilities that came with Dominican annexation with celebration. The editor of the *Christian Recorder*, Bishop Benjamin Tucker Tanner, expressed in an article on February 13, 1869 his hope that Haiti would be eventually be annexed as well as a result of Dominican annexation, and how both nations would benefit from integration into the United States:

a) Civil war would cease. No longer would the streams of their fair valleys be tinged with their children's blood.
b) The spirit of anarchy would cease. Turbulent spirits would know that the sword of justice was unsheathed.
c) Trade would revive. The stability of the government would ensure protection to invested capital.
d) Common schools would be opened. Children would no longer grow up to ignorant manhood.
e) The Bible would have free circulation and men would learn to walk in the light of it.

f) The religion of the Bible would have a fair chance. In the free fight, truth would not be manacled nor tripped.[29]

Tanner, along with many of the Protestant missionaries who were serving in Haiti at the time, viewed political instability, Catholicism, and vodou as their principle stumbling blocks in converting the population. Believing that annexation would bring stability to the Dominican Republic and that "Haiti will inevitably follow", Tanner continued to express confidence that "a free Bible and a free school" under U.S. rule would bring the peace and prosperity he and others had longed to see come to Haiti.[30]

By April 2, 1870, Tanner remained enthusiastic about the possibility of Dominican annexation, yet it was becoming clearer that many in both the United States and the Dominican Republic did not share his enthusiasm. Despite the claims of his article on that day that the vote in the Dominican capital of Santo Domingo was 1006 for annexation to 9 against, and that "the American flag was carried in triumph through the streets", doubts of this general sentiment can be found in his admission that he was not prepared to speak to the "purity of the ballot" as well as relaying that news in Washington indicated that the treaty would not be ratified.[31] While the AME, Dominican President Baez, and U.S. President Grant hoped for annexation, neither the U.S. Senate, the Dominican people, nor their Haitian neighbors shared their zeal. Much as he had done in 1862 with Spain, Baez's offer of annexation to the United States was given against the

[29] Benjamin Tucker Tanner, "Hayti and Dominica," *The Christian Recorder*, February 13, 1869, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.
[30] Benjamin Tucker Tanner, "Annexation of Dominica," *The Christian Recorder*, April 2, 1870, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.
[31] Ibid.

general will of the Dominican people. As a result, Dominican resistance to the possibility of their country being handed over by Baez to a foreign power reemerged, and with it Haitian concerns of also falling under foreign rule.

In a Senate hearing on March 27, 1871, Charles Sumner once again advocated for the rights of the U.S.'s Caribbean neighbors. In that speech, Sumner proclaimed that not only was the annexation of the Dominican Republic to the United States not in accordance with the will of the Dominican people, but that the Dominican government was illegitimately holding power by virtue of U.S. naval support. Sumner reached these conclusions during his investigations into the annexation issue while questioning the U.S. commercial agent in Santo Domingo, Raymond Perry. Referencing several requests by President Baez for U.S. warships to arrive before making any public announcements about the treaties that authorized annexation, Perry related to Sumner that "If the United States ships were withdrawn he [Baez] could not hold the reins of the Government".[32] Not only did Sumner take this a proof that neither Baez's rule nor annexation were generally supported by the Dominican people, but he saw further evidence in the sheer amount of U.S. naval power in the area as the treaty moved to the U.S. Senate for final approval. The fact that the U.S. had during that time twelve warships and two or three powerful monitors in the waters around Santo Domingo during the treaty deliberations appeared to Sumner as an excessively large fleet of combat ships for what was supposedly a peaceful negotiation.[33]

---

[32] Charles Sumner, *Violations of International Law and Usurpations of War Powers* (Washington: F. & J. Rives & Geo. A. Bailey, Reporters and Printers of the Debates of Congress, 1871), 10.
[33] Ibid, 6.

Along with his concerns that President Grant was utilizing the U.S. Navy to keep Baez in power and thereby force Dominican annexation, Sumner was also alarmed by reports that the fleet was increasingly threatening war with Haiti resulting from their alleged involvement in aiding Dominican resistance. The allegations presented against the Haitian government by the U.S. ambassador - and first African-American ambassador - Ebenezer Bassett, on behalf of the U.S. State Department, included charges of violating neutrality in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic by harboring Dominican resistance leaders and fighters while also providing them with weapons and ammunition.[34] Sumner's objections to the actions against Haiti by the State Department centered predominantly around, not so much the accusations themselves, but the show of force that accompanied them. As Ambassador Bassett presented the allegations to the Haitian government, in addition to the ships already stationed outside of Santo Domingo, the U.S. dispatched "our most powerful monitor, the Dictator", a frigate, and several additional monitors toward Haiti with the purpose of threatening the country if it did not comply.[35] Sumner argued to the U.S. Senate that the annexation of the Dominican Republic as it had been conducted was a betrayal of democratic principle and international law as the President and the State Department were using the threat of naval force to effectively seize one country as a territory while risking war with another. The Haitian government denied any official involvement in aiding the Dominican rebels, and

[34] U.S. Department of State, *Mr. Fish to Mr. Bassett*, by Hamilton Fish, Washington, D.C.: Foreign Relations of the United States June 24, 1871, page 568, http://images.library.wisc.edu/FRUS/EFacs2/1871-72/reference/frus.frus187172.i0031.pdf.
[35] Sumner, *Violations of International Law and Usurpations of War Powers*, 12.

responded by acknowledging its weakness compared to the surrounding U.S. military forces and pledging its continued commitment to neutrality in the matter, though it also stated that it could do nothing to prevent Haitian citizens from sympathizing or providing aid to the rebels.[36] Despite the efforts made by Presidents Grant and Baez to bring about Dominican annexation, both Sumner's arguments and prevalent concerns within the Senate over the prospect of adding such a large non-white population to the nation still struggling to integrate African-Americans into its citizenship effectively killed the annexation treaty in the Senate.

These events further altered the relationship between the United States and Haiti in a way that U.S. missionaries to Haiti had to navigate. For the AME, the attempts at Dominican annexation offered the possibility of greater stability in Haiti and therefore more effective mission work. This idea of partnership with the U.S. government in bringing stability and prosperity to Haiti in the late nineteenth century was continued in L. Ton Evans before and during the U.S. intervention in 1915. By 1915, we shall see that the AME, however, was hopeful but by that point doubtful of U.S. intentions. These events also heralded how the U.S. government viewed Haiti from that point until the occupation. By nearly going to war over perceived Haitian interference with the U.S. acquisition of the Dominican Republic, Haiti was now seen as a possible hindrance to the U.S.'s rising influence in the region. As we shall see, the many ways that Haiti proved to be both a potential benefit and hindrance to U.S. expansion are a significant part of what led to the 1915 intervention.

---

[36] Sumner, *Violations of International Law and Usurpations of War Powers*, 16.

Missionary Goals in Haiti After the U.S. Civil War

With the abolition debate in the U.S. settled, but the question of black self-governance still an issue for both U.S. and Haiti, the role of U.S. missionaries in Haiti shifted. For the United States, the question during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was how and to what extent the promises of the Emancipation Proclamation would be fulfilled, and African-Americans be integrated into U.S. citizenship. For Haiti, chronic political instability hindered its ability to serve as a symbol that people of African descent could govern themselves. For African-Americans advocating for expanded rights in U.S. society, 'The Black Republic' continued to be a source of hope and disappointment. It was this hope for Haiti's potential to be a symbol of black self-governance and prosperity, but acknowledgment of the challenges it faced in doing so, that attracted renewed AME missions in the later nineteenth century.

While the AME did not resume sending missionaries to Haiti until 1879, leaders such as Bishop Tanner continued to coordinate with other denominational missionaries, particularly Episcopal Bishop Holly, to report on events there in *The Christian Recorder*. Attempts to encourage large scale emigration to Haiti in 1861 had failed, and Lincoln's attempt to establish an African-American colony in Haiti had proved disastrous. Nevertheless, Tanner still reported on the discussion as it reemerged in the late 1870s as it became clear to many African-Americans that the promises of full equality during Reconstruction were not being fulfilled. Among the reasons previously reported in the *CR* in the 1860s as to why African-Americans rejected Haitian emigration had been concerns over political and racial strife in Haiti that made it no more appealing than

remaining in the U.S. These concerns were warranted as the Geffrard presidency followed the all too common pattern of sliding from initial reforms to dictatorship, resulting in his overthrow and exile by 1867. Missionaries in Haiti had been hopeful of Geffrard's early reforms, particularly with his emphasis on improving education. English Wesleyan resident missionary to Haiti, Mark Baker Bird, in his book *The Black Man; or, Haytian Independence* lamented the downfall of such an initially promising reformist, and concluded with a prescription for Haiti's chronic political unrest: Haiti was in need of moral as well as intellectual education.[37] For Bird, the only way to break the cycle of political upheaval that prevented Haiti from realizing its potential was to instill in its citizenry an equal amount of knowledge and morality that would lead to better governance, and Christianity could provide both. He ended his chapter on the end of the Geffrard presidency with the statement:

> Our final conclusion is, that the cure for revolutions is preventive; this will be found in knowledge and freedom, in the sense already explained. Christianity firmly and deeply planted in the heart of every child in the Republic, by means of primary education, with woman raised to her just elevation in society, is the only salvation of Hayti.[38]

Bird believed in universal, Christian education for all Haitians was the key to the nation's success.

Bird was not alone in his belief that education was the foundation of a brighter future for Haiti. The emphasis on education as a missionary tool was clear in Bishop

[37] M.B. Bird, *The Black Man; or, Haytian Independence* (New York: The American News Line Company, 1869), 422.
[38] Ibid, 436.

Tanner's arguments in favor of Dominican annexation, which he believed would bring about "A free Bible and a free school" with the promise that "Children would no longer grow up to ignorant manhood". These words may have been echoed by Tanner's correspondent in Haiti, Theodore Holly who also strongly advocated education as a primary missionary goal. In his reports concerning the evangelizing of Haitians living in the mountain districts, Holly described his work establishing elementary education as an essential component of spreading the gospel, making the point that "To use the Bible and Prayer Book; one at least must know how to read."[39] As international missionary work sharply rose in the late nineteenth century and, as we will see in the early twentieth century, education was an integral part of missionary activity in Haiti.

Based on AME accounts, the Haitian reaction to the educational evangelism appears to have been mixed. Rev. Payne of the AME Church had asked, "But what people can succeed in self-government unless they base it on the rock foundations of Christian principles? These principles will always create and perpetuate a public sentiment antagonistic to vice and crime, individual and national."[40] While we do not have direct accounts from the Haitian public about whether the efforts to teach Christian principles were regarded as beneficial or as a form of imperialism, we can make inferences of public sentiment from the missionary accounts. While missions earlier in the nineteenth century, such as Beanes' initial efforts, described growth and expansion of the congregations in Haiti, the resumption of AME missions to Haiti in 1879 implies that

[39] Holly, *Facts About the Church Mission in Haiti*, 7/10.
[40] Payne, 477.

they were working against local resistance. As Charles Mossel and his wife worked to establish a new mission in Port-au-Prince, as well as a mission Sunday school and day school headed by Sister Mossel, it is recorded that they did so "amid great opposition".[41] The kind of opposition they experienced on the local level is not specified. However, Rev. Payne believed that this mission and its schools would have succeeded if the missionary board had provided them with greater means to do so and were it not for the outbreak of civil war in Haiti which "caused great suffering on the part of our missionaries".[42]

This indicates that the missionaries themselves became targets during the unrest. The exact motivations for this are unclear, however, the fact that these missionaries did not experience this prior to this civil war suggest that the opposition faction was the one targeting the missionaries. This speaks to the special relationship that U.S. Protestant missionaries maintained with Haitian leaders throughout the nineteenth century. This is further supported by the fact that Sister Mossel was said to have composed a march "which she dedicated to the illustrious President Salomon, who conquered his enemies in the civil war previously mentioned, and restored peace and unity to his country".[43] Mossel's dedication and Payne's language demonstrate clearly a favoritism by the AME towards the current Haitian president, and therefore that there remained a strong connection between U.S. missionaries and Haitian politics in the late nineteenth century. It also demonstrates that this connection had the potential to put them in harm's way by

[41] Payne, 479.
[42] Ibid.
[43] Ibid, 480.

Haitians who opposed to their political allies. Perhaps most importantly, this demonstrates the ability for U.S. missionaries to at least indirectly provide Haitian perspectives during these events.

U.S. Expansion and Mole St. Nicholas

While the relationship between U.S. missionaries and the Haitian government remained strong into the late nineteenth century, the relationship between the U.S. and Haitian governments on the other hand was increasingly strained. Despite the earlier rejection of Dominican annexation by the U.S. Senate, U.S. interests in expanding its power and influence farther into the region continued to grow during the late nineteenth century. Directly across from Cuba, Haiti's geographical position along the Windward Passage put it in a place of growing strategic importance. Already an important trade route through the center of the Caribbean to Central America, the Windward Passage's importance grew as work towards a future canal through the continent progressed. Under Secretary of State William Henry Seward (1861-1869), U.S. policy increasingly looked towards acquiring strategic coaling stations throughout the region that could supply a growing U.S. naval and merchant marine fleet that was transitioning from sail to steam power.[44] A port at the northwestern tip of Haiti known as Mole St. Nicholas was particularly attractive both for its strategic position along the northern mouth of the Windward Passage as well as its deep water features that allowed large ships to dock. This port into the next century served as a cornerstone for U.S./Haitian diplomatic and

[44] Brenda Gayle Plummer, *Haiti and the United States: The Psychological Moment* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1992), 51.

military interaction, and events during this time only escalated U.S. government interests in obtaining either direct or indirect control over the Mole.

Haiti became increasingly aware of U.S. interests in Mole St. Nicholas, and, in a move that would later prove to be detrimental to Haiti's national sovereignty, used it at times as a potential bargaining chip. Much like the United States had been years before, Haiti in 1888 found itself being split in a contest between north and south. Both sides appealed to the United States for military support, and the U.S. government was eager to provide help to whichever side was the most willing to provide access to the Mole. Ultimately, it was the northern faction under the command of Florvil Hyppolite who reached out to the United States as the most willing to negotiate the annexation, or at least the use, of Mole St. Nicholas. U.S. ships quickly began defying the Haitian blockade of the northern ports, providing supplies that allowed Hyppolite's forces to successfully take control of the country by 1889.[45] Having held up its end of the deal, the United States by 1891 began formal negotiations to acquire the Mole.

By this time, famed abolitionist Frederick Douglass had been appointed as the U.S. Ambassador to Haiti, and his accounts demonstrate how the Hyppolite government, having now solidified its position, began to back down from its previous promises. On January 29, 1891, Douglass along with U.S. Rear Admiral Gherardi met with Haitian President Hyppolite and Secretary of Foreign Affairs Firmin concerning the lease of Mole St. Nicholas to the United States, to which Hyppolite agreed upon ratification of the

[45] Walter LaFeber, *The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion 1860-1898* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), *128*.

agreement by the Haitian legislative chambers.[46] Despite the promising start to these negotiations, Douglass related how it quickly became apparent that the Haitian government was stalling on carrying out the deal. On February 18, 1891, Douglass received a request from the Haitian government to suspend negotiations until Admiral Gherardi could produce proof that he was authorized to speak on behalf of the U.S. government.[47] The U.S. government provided the necessary proof, however, it was becoming impatient over gaining a return on its investment in the current Haitian administration because of what was clearly a stalling tactic. On April 21, Douglass reported having to assure the Haitians that the arrival of four additional U.S. warships with the one already present outside of Port-au-Prince, and two more reportedly en route, was not a threat to resume negotiations.[48]

Though the presence of a fleet of warships outside their capital hardly seemed anything short of a threat to the Haitians, the threat did little to expedite the process. That same day, Secretary Firmin accepted the documentation authorizing Admiral Gherardi to speak on behalf of the U.S. government, but then claimed he was waiting to hear from President Hyppolite on the matter.[49] The wait continued for two days until the Haitian government finally gave a firm answer: No. The reason presented to the U.S. was that the Haitian government was unwilling to comply with the condition that "the Government of Haiti will not lease or otherwise dispose of any port, harbor or other territory in its

[46] Frederick Douglass, *A Black Diplomat in Haiti: The Diplomatic Correspondence of U.S. Minister Frederick Douglass from Haiti, 1889-1891, Volume II* (Salisbury: Documentary Publications, 1977), 57-65.
[47] Ibid, 71-75.
[48] Ibid, 95-99.
[49] Ibid, 100-106.

dominions or grant any special privilege or rights of use therein to any other Power, State or Government".[50] This condition was in keeping with the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine, nevertheless, it was not nonnegotiable from the Haitian position. On May 2, Douglass, in a last-ditch effort to save the negotiations, offered to remove and edit the objected provision as well as the removal of the U.S. warships as a show of good faith to reopen negotiations, but Firmin rejects his appeal stating that the negotiations are closed.[51]

The United States did not acquire its coveted port in the Caribbean in the late nineteenth century, nor would it soon forget the unfulfilled assurances by a Haitian government it had helped put into place. Other events soon led to increased U.S. expansion in the region and beyond that delayed, but did not diminish, U.S. interest in the Mole. After a brief war with Spain in 1898, the United States acquired several new territories in the Caribbean and the Pacific. Nevertheless, Mole St. Nicholas's strategic position in the Caribbean remained a coveted port to maintain U.S. dominance in the region. The U.S. continued to try to acquire the Mole or, as would be the case in 1915, do whatever it took to ensure no other foreign power would.

Significance Towards 1915

By the year 1900, the stage had been set for future U.S. intervention of some form in Haiti and for U.S. Protestant missionaries to play a significant role in whatever form that intervention took. For African-American missionaries from the Baptist, AME, and Episcopal denominations, the struggle to establish a permanent presence in Haiti had

[50] Douglass, 114.
[51] Ibid, 135-136.

been difficult but they had nonetheless managed to maintain significant connections with the Haitian government across multiple administrations. In spite of diminishing interest, and failed attempts by the U.S. government, to encourage African-American emigration over the course of the nineteenth century, Bishop Holly and various AME missionaries had developed networks of interaction between Haitians and African-Americans hopeful that Haiti's future could inspire greater racial uplift for people of African descent. By the twentieth century, the question of abolition had long been answered and interest in African-American emigration had evaporated, but the continued hope of disenfranchised African-Americans that Haiti could still be proof of the ability of blacks to self-govern led the AME and some Baptists to redouble their efforts in Haiti.

The U.S. government's interest in Haiti remained into the twentieth century as well and was also built upon its interaction with Haiti during the nineteenth century, but for different reasons. Haiti no longer posed a symbolic threat to the United States now that slavery had been abolished, however, growing U.S. power in the region and increasing political instability in Haiti escalated in the early years of the twentieth century. This is where U.S. missionaries' interests in Haiti, and those of the U.S. government, merged in some ways while diverging in others. Having already established connections to the Haitian government for the purposes of safely evangelizing in Haiti, and trying to uplift the population through education, U.S. missionaries early in the twentieth century were increasingly concerned with the decreasing political stability there. The U.S. government likewise was increasingly concerned about Haiti's path of destabilization, yet this included strategic concerns that were not a part of the

missionaries' spiritual and humanitarian focus. With one Haitian government quickly being replaced by another, Baptist and AME missionaries attempted to strengthen ties between the U.S. and Haiti. Their role in Haiti's future became more even influential across borders as the U.S. took control of the country, though in a drastically different capacity.

CHAPTER IV

WARS OF THE SPIRIT AND THE FLESH: U.S. MISSIONARIES AND THE U.S. INVASION OF HAITI

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the role of U.S. missionaries in Haiti only increased in its significance. In the nineteenth century, missionaries and the denominational mission boards that they represented had formed partnerships with the Haitian government and worked to strengthen transnational racial ties between the Haitian government and African-Americans both during and after the U.S. debate on abolition. When Haiti reached its peak of political instability in the early twentieth century, the role of U.S. missionaries in Haiti from the Baptist and AME denominations changed to become much more interactive with the U.S. government concerning Haitian affairs. While missionaries to Haiti in the nineteenth century appealed to their respective mission boards for support in building and expanding evangelizing and educational programs for the Haitians, the deteriorating political situation there shifted the missionaries' focus to appealing directly to the U.S. government to intervene. This is seen in the stories of Baptist missionary, L. Ton Evans, and AME missionary, S.E. Churchstone Lord. As American intervention took shape around 1915, both U.S. missionaries appealed for the U.S. to intervene on Haiti's behalf, however, Evans' appealed directly to the government for the use of troops in the years preceding the

invasion. Lord by contrast appealed, first to the U.S. government and thereafter to the public, only after the July 1915 invasion and with more skepticism of the U.S. intent in Haiti.

L. Ton Evans and the Baptist Mission in Haiti

L. Ton Evans was the most consistent missionary voice trying to shape American intervention in Haiti. While his accounts do not provide us with direct voices from the Haitian public about the events before or during the American occupation, what they do provide is insight as to how Evans saw himself: A minister charged with the duty of guarding the interests of the Haitian people he served. Though we do not hear straight from their mouths what the Haitian people wanted from the U.S. before and after 1915, we do see in Evans' story at least what he fervently believed that they wanted. Prior to the American occupation, and for a short time during, Evans believed at this point that what the majority of the Haitian population wanted was some form of help from their strong neighbor to restore order and remove foreign interference. This he pursued passionately and with the belief that his role as a missionary could serve as a bridge between the U.S. and Haiti governments to achieve peace for the Haitian people.

While the zeal for pursuing international missions continued to spread across Protestant denominations, the focus of these groups at the turn of the twentieth century remained on missions to Asia. The region of the Caribbean and Latin America, including Haiti, had ceased to be a serious point of focus for either American or European missionary work after earlier attempts in the nineteenth century had failed to take permanent hold as Haitian political instability continued to escalate. Resumption of a

U.S. Baptist mission presence in Haiti, therefore, came about not from the denominational mission board but from pressure applied by an individual minister; A Welsh immigrant to the United States by the name of Reverend L. Ton Evans. Prior to his immigration in 1902, Evans had been a well-known figure in the Barry Dock community of Wales where he had founded the Mount Pleasant English Baptist Church in Cadoxton, and was also a leading advocate there for temperance and social work.[1] At the ceremony his church held for his departure to the U.S., he was recalled by the community as a man who "could be very often seen holding forth alone late on Saturday nights before public-houses, leading drunken men home, and not infrequently visiting the poorest and most disreputable day and night on order to tell them of Christ and to seek to lead them to better and happier lives".[2]

Along with gravitating towards helping the least fortunate within his community, Evans also had previous experience with overseas mission work that shaped his later zeal for the Haitian people. In 1891, he had traveled to survey mission projects that were active in Egypt, Palestine, and Turkey, and in the following year went a step further and was given the position of general missionary for Jamaica, Haiti, and Santo Domingo by the Jamaica Missionary Board.[3] This initial trip to Haiti, and Evans' compulsion to aid those whom he felt suffered the greatest from poverty, both financially and spiritually, left him with a lingering desire to return to do further work. However, this mission was

[1] "Departure of the Rev. L. Ton Evans. Farewell Gathering at Mount Pleasant Chapel, Cadoxton. Several Presentations to the Rev. Gentleman," *Barry Docks News*, March 7, 1902, http://newspapers.library.wales/view/4608029/4608034/36/LIVERPOOL.
[2] "Farewell Meeting and Presentation at Tonyrefail," *Barry Docks News*, March 7, 1902, http://newspapers.library.wales/view/4608029/4608034/36/LIVERPOOL.
[3] Olsen, 25.

cut short when, after two years in Haiti, his wife became ill and they were forced to return to Wales for her recovery.[4] Then in 1902, he and his wife departed Wales for him to both pastor a church in Pennsylvania and to push U.S. Baptist agencies towards greater involvement in Haiti. Further accolades by his former community in Wales foreshadowed, not only the tenacity in which he later dedicated himself to Haiti's poor, but also how far he was willing to go to call public attention to injustice. Along with being described as "possessing rare fighting qualities, accentuated by persistency in the cause of right, and by an invincibility and unconquerableness which were inherent in his ministrations and missionary exertions", he was also described as possessing a "healthy fanaticism" which "did not necessarily create public opinion, but it was an element which essentially drew public opinion after it", and it was hoped that this energy would follow his labors across the Atlantic.[5] It was these qualities of compassion for those he perceived to be disadvantaged and zealous advocacy that would eventually place Evans in conflict with the U.S. occupation of Haiti.

Initially, Evans looked to the U.S. as a potential stabilizing force capable of restoring order and prosperity to the Haitian people. As early as June 29, 1900, Evans had already indicated to the Baptist Foreign Mission Board that he had reached the conclusion that Christianity and foreign assistance were essential to the future of the Haitian people. At that time, Evans believed the biggest threat to the Haitian people was

---

[4] U.S. Department of State, *Memorandum to the Honorable Woodrow Wilson, President of The United States: Present Situation in Haiti, showing some of the Causes of Discontent*, by L. Ton Evans, 838.00/1547, Washington, D.C.: 1918, 2.

[5] "Departure of the Rev. L. Ton Evans. Farewell Gathering at Mount Pleasant Chapel, Cadoxton. Several Presentations to the Rev. Gentleman," *Barry Docks News*, March 7, 1902, http://newspapers.library.wales/view/4608029/4608034/36/LIVERPOOL.

the widespread practice of "Voodooism", and that this was both spiritually and socially corrupting. Pointing specifically to the use of animal sacrifices, and he claimed sometimes cannibalism, in these rituals, he concluded that "Their only hope politically and morally is the spread of the true gospel light. This must be done by some society outside".[6] He also made it clear what "society outside" he thought should take such a role as he continued to point out that Cuba and Puerto Rico were already benefiting from evangelism by the United States, and that the 2 million citizens of Haiti should reap those benefits as well.[7] These views of what he considered to be the source of Haiti's problems, and the benevolent role he believed the United States could and should play, informed the role that Evans saw for himself as a U.S. missionary in Haiti.

Only months after arriving in the United States, Evans began petitioning President Theodore Roosevelt to have the U.S. government itself take a more active role in Haitian affairs. Evans' time in Haiti had changed his initial conclusion that voudou was the central cause of Haiti's problems, instead convincing him that chronic revolutions and increasing political instability in Haiti resulting from outside interference was the primary cause of Haitian woes. From Edwardsville, PA on August 20, 1902, Evans wrote to Roosevelt in hopes of convincing him of the need to expand U.S. military support that was already taking place in Haiti during the current revolution. While praising Roosevelt for sending a gunboat to defend U.S. citizens in the northern city of Cap Haitien, Evans implored him to extend that protection to native Haitians there and in other port cities

[6] L. G. Jordan, *Up the Ladder in Foreign Mission* (Nashville: National Baptist Publishing Board, 1903), 78-79.
[7] Ibid, 79.

who were increasingly at the mercy of regional marauders.[8] Appealing to a sense of moral obligation for the U.S. to step in and help the Haitian people, Evans also pointed to threats that existed not only to the Haitians but also potentially against U.S. interests there and in the region. The "few greedy office seekers" in Haiti that Evans blamed for the troubles were also, according to him, compounding the nation's troubles by appointing storekeepers and merchants who financially benefited from internal Haitian conflicts and acted in official or semiofficial capacity as representatives of foreign governments.[9]

Here we see that Evans viewed his role as a missionary in a wider scope than that of U.S. missionaries of the previous century. Involving far more than providing a Christian education with the goal of giving Haitians the technical skills and moral characteristics Baptist, Episcopal, and AME believed were necessary for Haiti to become prosperous, Evans's role included political activities which he believed served Haitian interests. This suggests that the disintegrating Haitian government, and the perceived threat of foreign interference, convinced Evans that the Haitian people were suffering as much from earthly politics as they were from a lack of Christian spiritual teaching. If the greatest problems Haitians faced were political, and Evans' actions throughout these events suggest he believed just that, then education alone could not bring them peace.

---

[8] United States Congress. Select Committee on Haiti and Santo Domingo, *Inquiry into Occupation and Administration of Haiti and Santo Domingo: Hearings Before a Select Committee on Haiti and Santo Domingo, United States Senate, Sixty-Seventh Congress, First Session, Pursuant to S. RES. 112 Authorizing a Special Committee to Inquire Into the Occupation and Administration of the Territories of the Republic of Haiti and the Dominican Republic*, Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1922, 154.

[9] Ibid, 154-155.

The only way Evans could therefore serve the Haitian people was, in his mind, though political activity on their behalf.

While the request to Roosevelt did not result in expanded protections for Haitian citizens, Evans did not give up on appealing for government intervention, nor could he manage to keep himself away from Haiti. After only six years at the First Baptist Church in Edwardsville, Evans resigned as Pastor in 1908 to gather support from churches in Wales for him to return to Haiti as General Missionary and Field Secretary.[10] This time Evans stayed in Haiti from 1908 to 1912, which coincided with the beginning of the most turbulent period of political unrest that Haiti had yet endured. By 1911, he became the official representative of Haiti to the World's Baptist Alliance meetings in Philadelphia, and in the same year brought to the United States a petition signed by the highest members of the Haitian government asking American philanthropists such as Andrew Carnegie and J.P. Rockefeller to finance the construction of a Christian-based National Industrial College[11] Along with appeals to American businessmen to expand education in Haiti, Evans continued to also press successive government administrations to provide for greater protection for Haiti from the foreign destabilizing influences he had spoken of after his first Haitian mission. Though he attempted to appeal to the Taft, and later Wilson, administration about European and even U.S. interference in Haitian political affairs, it was Germany that Evans had determined by then to be the biggest threat to that nation's stability.[12]

---

[10] U.S. Department of State, *Memorandum to the Honorable Woodrow Wilson*, 2.
[11] Ibid.
[12] United States Congress, 153.

Government and Missionary Interests Align

To say that German businessmen had pursued interests in Haiti was no baseless accusation. A large and thriving German merchant population in Haiti had developed since the late nineteenth century, and German businessmen had certainly gone to great lengths to gain an economic advantage in Haiti by circumventing one of the more restrictive Haitian laws to foreign investors. Over a hundred years after their bitter struggle against slavery, Haitians were known for their animosity towards foreigners, particularly white foreigners. This is best exemplified in the Haitian Constitution of 1805, in which Article 12 of the Preliminary Declaration states that "No whiteman of whatever nation he may be, shall put his foot on this territory with the title of master or proprietor, neither shall he in the future acquire any property therein."[13] The intended goal of this was a protectionary measure to ensure that Haiti would never again fall under either direct or indirect foreign control, however, German merchants of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century found a clever means to get around the law. Because foreigners were prohibited from owning property in Haiti, German merchants sometimes married Haitian women who could legally own land and were thus able to establish networks within the community.[14]

To what extent the perceived threat of Germany influenced Wilson's decision to invade Haiti remains a matter of historiographical debate. Other works discussed so far

[13] "The 1805 Constitution of Haiti," transcribed online by Bob Corbett on April 4, 1999, accessed February 27, 2016, faculty.webster.edu/corbetre/haiti/history/earlyhaiti/1805-const.htm.
[14] "MILESTONES 1914-1920 – The U.S. Invasion and Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934," U.S. Department of State Office of the Historian, accessed March 25, 2016, https://history.state.gov/milestones/1914-1920/haiti.

have pointed out intervention in Haiti as a natural offshoot of Wilson's own beliefs of the U.S. being a missionary of democracy to its neighbors. Furthermore, while some works like Harley Notter's *The Origins of the Foreign Policy of Wilson* cite German interference as provoking U.S. intervention, Davis Healy's *Drive to Hegemony* points out instances in which the U.S. was already itself gaining control of Haitian finances.[15] Whether or not the perceived threat of German control of Haiti was the primary reason for the U.S. decision to intervene, the correspondence within the Wilson administration suggests that it did have significant bearing on it. More importantly for the purpose of this study, the evidence reveals that L. Ton Evans believed in that threat and felt compelled towards political activism because of it.

The correspondence that Reverend Evans sent to the Wilson administration, if acknowledged, would have only fueled a growing concern in Washington over Berlin's seemingly expanding control in Haiti. In what became Haiti's most politically unstable period yet, between 1911 and 1915, seven Haitian presidents were either deposed or assassinated while in office. While the dramatic increase in revolutions in Haiti were a concern in and of themselves to Wilson, this instability so close to American borders within the larger backdrop of an increasing German influence over the Haitian economy and the coming of the First World War forced Wilson to view Haiti in terms of strategic importance. Once again, the port of Mole St. Nicholas, which the U.S. had tried and failed on multiple occasions to secure some measure of control over from Haiti, returned

[15] Harley Notter, *The Origins of the Foreign Policy of Woodrow Wilson* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937), 302. David Healy, *Drive to Hegemony: The United States in the Caribbean, 1898-1917* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988).

as a major focus of U.S. policy in the region. Due to its strategic location at the northern mouth of the Windward Passage, any naval power who controlled the port of Mole St. Nicholas could potentially control the flow of trade through the recently constructed Panama Canal. As tensions between Germany and the United States continued to escalate after 1914, while pursing neutrality in the war consuming the European powers, Washington increasingly viewed Germany as a hostile power. It was under these conditions that the Wilson Administration by 1915 were concerned that Germany's interest in Haiti extended beyond economic interests to include military designs for the region.

Correspondence between President Wilson and Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan revealed the importance of Mole St. Nicholas to U.S. interests, as it was frequently a point of conversation as early as 1913. In a letter addressed to Wilson on June 14, 1913, Bryan followed up with a previous conversation concerning Mole St. Nicholas by recommending negotiations with Haiti to either acquire it upon the merits of its position and port depth, or to at least to "take it out of the market so that no other nation will attempt to secure a foothold there".[16] As the correspondence continued, Bryan suggested a proposal to be negotiated with the Haitian Government in which the United States would gain twenty miles of Haitian territory consisting of Mole St. Nicholas (ten miles from the center of the mouth to the harbor and ten miles east inland from the shoreline), that all persons who presently resided within this territory be granted

[16] Arthur S. Link, et al., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, Volume 27:1913 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1978), 519.

American citizenship upon application, that all persons within that territory who do not wish to become American citizens were to be compensated for their land at market value, and to negotiate a price for which the Haitian Government would be willing to sell this territory.[17] On July 23, 1913, Wilson responded to Bryan's proposal with an approval of each of the terms outlined in his plan.[18] Though the Haitian Government did not agree to these terms, this exchange makes it clear that the United States wished to secure a foothold in Haiti, or to at least prevent others from gaining one.

As chronic financial default continued into 1914 to threaten some form of European intervention in Haiti, it was clear that Germany, though the principle threat to U.S. interests in the region, was not the only cause for concern. Even as war between France and Germany was already in motion, the majority of the Haitian debt being owed to both nations resulted in a proposed tripartite agreement by the German Government between France, the United States, and themselves, in which France and Germany would share a degree of control over Haiti.[19] Such an agreement never came into being, however, as the suggestion of it by the German Government was not well received by the U.S. Government. In a 1914 address to the American Academy of Political and Social Science, then former Governor of West Virginia, William Alexander MacCorkle seems to have viewed this proposal as a warning by the German Government threatening intervention if the financial situation were not resolved.[20] No more willing to allow a

[17] Link, et al., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, Volume 27:1913, 519.
[18] Ibid, 557-558.
[19] William Alexander MacCorkle, *The Monroe Doctrine in Its Relation to the Republic of Haiti* (New York: The Neale Publishing Company, 1915), 93.
[20] MacCorkle, 94.

friendly European nation to assert control in the Caribbean than a rival, there were concerns over allowing France or even Britain from expanding their influence into Haiti as well. Aside from the Monroe Doctrine prohibiting any European power, whether a current ally or enemy, from gaining further control in the hemisphere, the emerging war between these nations brought its own considerations. One such consideration looked to possible outcomes of the First World War, in which even Allied nations such as Britain and France, if either were to gain control of a Caribbean nation such as Haiti, could potentially forfeit their overseas territories to Germany if they were to lose the war.[21]

At this stage, Evans' goal of greater U.S. involvement in Haiti against the threat of German interference began to align with changing perceptions in Washington over the threat of Germany. While the threat of Germany or some other European power using a destabilized Haiti to either economically or militarily gain a foothold in the region was a theoretical concern to the Wilson Administration, Rev. Evans claimed based on personal interactions with German businessmen that they were actively involved in destabilizing the Haitian government. In one particular instance, Evans recounts that while attending the World's Baptist Alliance meeting in 1911, he delved into a heated exchange with a German banker over the recent Haiti revolutions during the previous year who boasted, "I financed them from Berlin, as well as the previous revolutions, and furnished ammunition, and have been staying in Germany several years arranging these matters".[22] Whatever this unnamed German banker meant by 'these matters', Evans took it as

[21] MacCorkle, 36.
[22] United States Congress, 156.

admission that the man had actively financed revolutionary activities against the Haitian government on behalf of German interests. Evans went further to say that conversations with previous Haitian heads of state had revealed the significance of German involvement in spurning revolutions in Haiti and thwarting U.S. interests there. In reference to President Simon's infrastructure projects, which had led to the MacDonald Contract allowing a U.S. company to pursue railroad construction, that this government friendly to U.S. commercial interests had been overthrown with the help of German propaganda accusing Simon of having "sold Haiti to the United States", and $350,000 of German money used to bribe Haitian officials to oppose Simon's reforms.[23] Such actions worked against current as well as former U.S. policy in regards to the Simon government. Under the Taft administration, the U.S. had already sold weapons and coal to the Simon government, further indicating its wish to see Simon remain in power.[24]

Though the U.S. government became increasingly nervous about the potential for German control in Haiti at this time, it was not yet enough to inspire direct action of its part. Evans' warnings of German meddling in Haiti appear to have gone unheeded, much to his frustration in the years preceding 1915. He later lamented how he approached the State Department in Washington again and again in hopes that the U.S. would intervene in these matters, and Evans describes President Simon before his overthrow confiding in him "in actual tears and all but heartbroken" that the railroads, plantations, and possibly

[23] United States Congress, 157.
[24] Brenda Gayle Plummer, *Haiti and the Great Powers, 1902-1915* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988), 157.

thousands of Haitian lives would have been saved if only the U.S. had come to his aid.[25] Whether Wilson ever received or read any of these reports from Evans is uncertain, but if he did they certainly did nothing to put him at ease over the potential German involvement in the region. What is certain is that Evans used his role as a U.S. missionary in Haiti to try to influence government policy, though it was apparently ineffective at this stage.

Evans' interactions during these events reveal how he navigated his perceived role as a missionary with the larger institution of the Baptist Church, and the Haitian and U.S. governments. In terms of the larger Baptist institution, his appointment as the representative of Haiti for the World's Baptist Alliance reveals that, at this time, he was regarded as the face of the denomination in Haiti. This relationship between the individual and the institution that he represented later became strained as Evans' view of the intervention changed, but prior to 1915 they were seemingly of one accord. Furthermore, Evans had clearly expanded upon earlier missionary roles of direct contact with the Haitian government. As earlier U.S. missionaries had appealed directly to the Haitian government on behalf of themselves and their congregations, Evans brought appeals from the Haitian government to U.S. philanthropists, and personal appeals to the U.S. government for aid to Haiti. Evans had gone from establishing connections in the Haitian government, as his predecessors had done, to acting (and viewing himself) as an unofficial intermediary between the Haitian government and the most powerful people in U.S. business and government.

[25] United States Congress, 157.

Business and Government Interests Align

Speaking further on the role of U.S. businessmen, missionaries were not the only potential source of information that the Wilson Administration had concerning German involvement in Haiti's rapid destabilization. Though this other group had more direct U.S. government contact (though not for lack of trying on Evans' part), and very different concerns and motivations, than that of a missionary. At the time, the U.S. State Department's policies towards Haiti suffered from a lack of Caribbean specialists as well as no knowledge of Haiti on the part of Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan.[26] Hindered by this lack of regional knowledge in trying to formulate policy, Bryan was forced to turn to American businessmen who regularly conducted business in and with Haiti for advice. The most influential of these businessmen was Roger L. Farnham. As vice-president of the National City Bank of New York and of the Banque Nationale in Haiti, as well as becoming president of the National Railway of Haiti in 1913, Farnham was intimately familiar with Haitian affairs, and because of this Bryan relied heavily on him for advice.[27] However, this familiarity with Haitian affairs through his interactions there, which Bryan found so beneficial, also meant that Farnham had his own motivations. Driven to secure a customs receivership for the Banque National from the Haiti government, Farnham approached multiple Haitian governments with loan offers in exchange, and threats of U.S. intervention when they refused, in spite of the fact that the State Department had insisted in the 1910 Banque contract that the provision for customs

[26] Schmidt, 48.
[27] Ibid.

control be removed.[28] Lincoln's mistake in trusting U.S. business interests in Haiti was to a degree revisited, yet in spite of Bryan's apparent reliance on Farnham and other businessmen for information on the situation in Haiti, there appears to have been a disconnect in the years preceding the invasion between business interests and Government policy that had more strategic concerns.

By the beginning of 1915, the correspondence between Wilson and Bryan indicated that their anxiety over the situation in Haiti and the threat of Germany expanding its control over the nation was reaching critical mass. As early as January 7, Bryan advised President Wilson concerning unconfirmed press reports that Germany had already begun using Mole St. Nicholas as a supply base.[29] While these reports appear to have been false, the fact that the Wilson Administration was alarmed by the possibility of Germany obtaining the port remained evident, culminating in April of that year with the decision to intervene. On April 5, 1915, Secretary Bryan received word from the White House that the Haitian situation could no longer be tolerated. Beginning by stating that "The time to act is now", President Wilson laid out two demands that the U.S. be granted "use and control of Mole Saint Nicholas, or, at the least, the exclusion there of foreign control", and that an advisor be appointed to act as a spokesperson for the United States to the Haitian Government.[30] Immediately after this statement came the call to action

[28] Schmidt, 49.
[29] Arthur S. Link, et al., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 32: January 1 – April 16, 1915 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1980), 28.
[30] Link, et al., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, Volume 32: January 1 – April 16, 1915, 479.

followed by the demand that Mole St. Nicholas either be ceded to the United States or barred from being ceded to anyone else.

This demonstrates the limits of the role missionaries played in the events leading to the 1915 intervention. While L. Ton Evans had attempted to appeal to the U.S. government to intervene, his was by no means the only or even deciding factor in the U.S. decision to invade Haiti. While Evans certainly tried to convince Wilson of a German threat to Haiti, there is no evidence that Wilson was influenced directly by Evans' appeals. It is far more likely that William Jennings Bryan's reliance on Farnham for information about Haiti had more bearing on Wilson's understanding of the situation. If Wilson did in fact ever hear of Evans' accounts of German businessmen plotting against Haitian governments, it likely only added anecdotally to Wilson's already existing concerns over the lack of order in Haiti and how potential European adversaries could exploit it. Though Evans demonstrated what he perceived to be a new role for a missionary in Haiti that included working between the Haitian and American governments, it is not clear that he impacted the decision to intervene. He and another missionary had a far more measurable impact on U.S. policy regarding the subsequent occupation.

The AME and African-American Public Opinion

It is important to acknowledge the significant difference in how L. Ton Evans viewed his role in Haiti in contrast to what Haiti meant to AME missionaries like S.E. Churchstone Lord. Based on his background, Evans was motivated to evangelize and aid the Haitian people out of sympathy and moral conviction towards a people he perceived

as oppressed and downtrodden. For the AME and African-Americans, Haiti had always meant something else than a people to be pitied. They of course shared the hope for Haiti to be more stable and prosperous but, for the AME and African-Americans, Haiti's success had always been hoped for as a racial vindication of black self-governance. These differing views of the Haitians and what Haiti meant as a racial symbol explain the divide between Evans, who was enthusiastic about U.S. intervention in Haiti, and the AME, who were disappointed with the apparent need for U.S. intervention. For Evans, U.S. involvement in Haiti was the solution to a problem, but for the AME it was akin to admitting that Haiti could not succeed on its own.

Hopes from the African-American community that the nation of Haiti could serve as a model for Black self-governance had continued into the early twentieth century, but the increasing political unrest there had tempered those hopes. Bishop Holly in the late nineteenth century had dismissed Haiti's frequent revolutions and power struggles as a healthy part of Haitian democracy where the people could and did enforce the constitution by removing corrupt leaders, but the accelerated frequency of these events in the early twentieth century caused increasing doubt within the African American community about Haiti's future.[31] AME missionary representatives to Haiti often tried to dissuade the increasing pessimism about the fate of Haiti by describing the Haitian situation within the larger context of political instability throughout Latin America. AME Bishop C.S. Smith, while on a tour of AME Church activities throughout the West Indies

[31] Lester D. Langley, *The Americas in the Age of Revolution: 1750-1850* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 143.

in 1901, pointed out that, since Venezuela had declared its independence in 1811, the country had endured incessant civil war between 1846 and 1870, and "Can any one truthfully write for so long a period a bloodier page of Haytien history than this?".[32] While Haiti had suffered several revolutions since its founding in 1804, Smith pointed out that it was by no means a phenomenon unique to the "Black Republic" and could be found throughout the Western Hemisphere with few exceptions. Along with pointing out examples of the years of peace in between periods of unrest in Haiti, Smith also made the case that Haiti had not (by his writing in 1901) experienced any revolutions since 1888 and "Of how many of the South American Republics can the same be said?".[33]

The editor of the AME *Christian Recorder*, Henry Theodore Johnson, further supported the point that Haiti's political instability was not atypical in Latin America when he wrote comparing the situation of Cuba in 1902 to that of Haiti. As Cuba had gained independence that year after having been occupied by the U.S. after the Spanish-American War, the new nation already faced difficulties comparable to those often pointed out of Haiti. Along with business interests between the U.S. and Cuba calling for U.S. annexation, Cuba was heavily in debt, which threatened to close down an education system that the U.S. had already spent thousands of dollars trying to establish on the island.[34] While Cuba seemed to be suffering from much of the same indebtedness and

[32] C.S. Smith, "Bishop Smith's West Indian Tour. Letter Number 5," *The Christian Recorder*, April 25, 1901, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Henry Theodore Johnson, "Cuba Retrograding," *The Christian Recorder*, August 7, 1902, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.

governmental inefficiency that had so long been used to condemn Haiti, Johnson defends Haiti's difficulties as those that were faced by a self-reliant nation.

> Compare the two countries, Hayti and Cuba, and what do we see? Revolution in one which will cause much trouble, but which will leave a government still free and independent. In the other we see stagnation and ruin looming up and the only hope of redemption is annexation to another government. One country much maligned, is heroically carving out its own destiny; the other is crying pitiously for help. Cuba has the sympathy of the powerful government of the United States, while Hayti has the enmity of a large part of the civilized world.[35]

Though Bishop Smith did not explicitly state why he believed Haiti had received much more condemnation and ridicule than other nations in the region enduring similar issues, Johnson asserted his conclusion that the only real difference between Haiti and Cuba was that Haiti uniquely possessed a "black government", and that "in this there is food for much thought".[36]

Despite these defenses on behalf of Haiti's image, there were voices within the AME that acknowledged that, while Haiti may not be unique in its instability, the situation there was troubling all the same. Johnson himself wrote later that same year that, as the centennial of Haitian independence approached, there was very little for either Haitians or previously hopeful African-Americans to celebrate.[37] Unable to ignore the chronic revolutions and despotic rulers that they continued to produce, Johnson lamented

[35] Johnson, "Cuba Retrograding."
[36] Ibid.
[37] Henry Theodore Johnson, "Self-Bleeding Haiti," *The Christian Recorder*, September 18, 1902, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.

that Haiti's history so far had only served to support the nation's, and the race's harsher critics.

> The perennial revolutions that occur in most South American countries, and the rarity of such from the Black government of Liberia, are not taken into account by those who see in the sanguinary history of Haiti, the black man's failure at self-government. Sad it is that the indictment backed by the specifications which Haiti furnishes is too tenable to be either gainsaid or denied.[38]

Johnson concluded his lament over Haiti's situation with what could be considered foresight into how a recent attempt by Germany to collect Haitian debts risked the United States becoming more actively involved. Both French and German warships had been sent to Haiti on occasion to collect payments owed by Haiti at gunpoint, and in each case the United States government, looking to the Monroe Doctrine, watched with unease as European warships came too close for comfort to the U.S.'s sphere of influence. After a German ship threatened Haiti by targeting and destroying a Haitian gunboat, Johnson predicted that the U.S. government, whom he described as a policing force of Haiti against foreign powers, was growing impatient with the situation and that some form of intervention may be on the horizon.[39] Though Johnson's fear of direct U.S. intervention in Haitian affairs to prevent European involvement was not yet to come, a more immediate result of European warships trying to collect Haitian debt was the adoption of the Roosevelt Corollary in 1904, which extended the scope of the Monroe Doctrine to

[38] Johnson, "Self-Bleeding Haiti."
[39] Ibid.

have the United States act as arbiter in any dispute between the European powers and independent nations within the Americas.

While some in the AME may have feared the possible need for American intervention to stabilize the Haitian political and economic situation, there were also those who looked desperately for greater intervention from the AME itself. During an assessment of the mission in Port de Paix in 1901, AME missionary representative S. George Dorce submitted a report condemning the Church for allowing the mission there, and throughout Haiti, to go for so long without any financial support. Speaking to what he perceives as indifference by the Church to the status of the overall mission in Haiti, Dorce pleaded that:

> If Port de Paix is allowed to have the same fair of Miragoane, Carrefour and other places where the A.M.E. Church has started to operate, I shall have to resign and take my transfer to some other conference, for the general Church looks after the work in this section by spells, and yet great results are expected. Think of it! Five long years the Missionary Board never sent me one cent, and not one letter from 1892 to 1897.[40]

Despite reporting severe financial strain on mission resources in Haiti, Dorce believed that the situation was easily salvageable, and echoed previous missionaries such Holly's belief on what he considered the long-term solution for the uplift of the Church in Haiti. Writing on conditions in May of that year, Dorce stated that, structurally speaking the church and school in Port de Paix were in good condition, and that only $25 each month through December would be enough to maintain the teaching staff that had gone for some

[40] George S. Dorce, "Haytien Letter," *The Christian Recorder*, September 5, 1901, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.

time without pay.[41] The interdenominational focus on providing education for the Haitian people continued to be the central goal of American-based missions to Haiti in the early twentieth century.

The concerns of Dorce contrast with those of Evans in terms of who they are appealing to for help. While Evans within the Baptist denomination appealed to the religious institution as well as the U.S. government and philanthropists, Dorce within the AME only appealed to his own religious institution. This lack of appeal to the government as a means to stabilize the situation in Haiti is consistent with Johnson's lament that Haiti may need American intervention, but that this was not the desired outcome. Whereas, Evans sought help for the people of Haitian from anywhere he believed was able to give it, the goal within the AME was still based on the hope that Haiti could solve its problems on its own with additional support from the AME. While Evans believed the U.S. had the responsibility to act as a good neighbor, the AME understandably wanted the Black Republic, which they had held as a symbol of black liberation and self-governance, to succeed without the use of white interference and oversight.

Resource provisions notwithstanding, the AME Church continued to monitor Haiti's situation with vested interest along with growing concern. An article in The A.M.E. Church Review in 1907 demonstrates that there were still those advocating the possible emigration of African-Americans looking to escape racial oppression while also bemoaning the limited options available to them. Of only four stated options around the

[41] Dorce.

world (Liberia, Abyssinia, Haiti, and Santo Domingo), the article discounted Haiti as an option due to language and culture differences, as well as Abyssinia and Santo Domingo for the same reasons, leaving Liberia as the only option.[42] Despite Haiti no longer being seriously considered as a point of emigration by either the U.S. government or the African-American community, interest in Haitian political affairs by both continued. At least one prominent member of the African-American community shared the missionaries' belief that education was the answer to Haiti's problems. Having been a strong proponent of education as a gateway to the successful uplift of African-Americans, Booker T. Washington wrote in 1911 that the same would be true of the people of Haiti. In Washington's view, Haiti had all the potential to be a progressive nation if it could only minimize the military despotism that had so chronically plagued the nation, as well as refocusing education there to emphasize agricultural sciences whose skills would allow the Haitian population to better utilize their own natural resources.[43]

As was pointed out with L. Ton Evans, the accounts of the AME regarding Haiti do not provide us with direct Haitian voices concerning these historical events. What they do provide us with is how the members of the AME viewed themselves in relation to Haiti and the role they took upon themselves, which differed in some ways to how Evans' viewed his role. Throughout Evans's and Lord's time as missionaries in Haiti, both viewed their roles as missionaries as including advocacy for the Haitian people. However, for Lord and the AME, they possessed the preexisting belief that their role was

[42] H.T. Kealing, "Only Four in the World," *The A.M.E. Church Review*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 1907, 75.
[43] Booker T, Washington, Geraldine McTigue, and Nan E Wooff, *Booker T. Washington Papers Volume 10: 1909-11*, (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1981), 567-568.

advocacy on behalf of their race regardless of the geopolitical borders they inhabited. This added a dimension to the AME's work in Haiti as they were not only supportive of Haitian prosperity politically, spiritually, and economically, but in so doing they believed they were supporting themselves as well as everyone else of African descent. While this still leaves us with only indirect Haitian perspectives at best of these events provided by the missionaries who saw themselves as their advocates, it provides us with the direct perspectives of a Baptist who was motivated by spiritual concerns, and an AME missionary who was motivated by spiritual concerns and a shared racial identity with the Haitians.

The United States Intervenes

Much like the U.S. missionaries, others in the U.S. also believed that Haiti had several advantages if only given the chance to use them. Beyond the natural resources that had given it a lucrative status when it was a French colony, the Roosevelt Corollary had seemingly removed the threat of foreign attack. When speaking of the advantages of Haiti in 1911, Booker T. Washington quoted explorer Sir Harry Johnston, "She (Haiti) has no enemies because the United States is her all-powerful friend".[44] However, 1911 was the beginning of a significant turning point in U.S.-Haitian relations as Haiti faced escalating problems from within rather than from direct foreign attack. This was the start of the turbulent four-year period in which Haiti would experience its worst political instability to date, and U.S. fears that Germany might be, at least indirectly, stoking the flames of chronic revolution to gain control of Haiti would soon force Wilson's hand.

[44] Washington, et al., 568.

The moment finally came in 1915 when, as the Haitian political situation continued to deteriorate, the U.S. tried once more to acquire Mole St. Nicholas. As the situation in Haiti had become intolerable by April, Secretary of State Bryan had later that month assigned Paul Fuller Jr. the task of reporting on conditions there. The son of President Wilson's Confidential Agent in Mexico, Fuller conveyed to President Sam of Haiti the U.S. position that his government would be supported against further revolutionary activity in exchange for following the advice of the American Legation at Port-au-Prince concerning honest and efficient administration of the government, as well as assurances that Mole St. Nicholas either be ceded to the U.S. or at least not be ceded to anyone else.[45] When President Sam was assassinated on July 27, years of American concern over the political instability in Haiti turned Monroe Doctrine rhetoric into military action.

On July 28, 1915 the *U.S.S. Washington* under the command of Admiral William Caperton sailed into the bay outside of the Haitian capital of Port-au-Prince. Under orders from U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, 330 American Marines disembarked from the *Washington* and swiftly took control of the Haitian Government meeting almost no resistance in the process. However, in spite of the amount of time spent by the Wilson Administration discussing whether or not to pursue military intervention in Haiti, the ease by which that action was taken, and Wilson's rationale of a moral imperative to restore order in Haiti, what the administration's post-invasion correspondence revealed is that there was no plan in place of what exactly the United States would do with Haiti once it

[45] Arthur S. Link, *Wilson: The Struggle for Neutrality, 1914-1915* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), 531.

was under their control. In a letter to Wilson addressed on August 2, 1915, Bryan's successor as Secretary of State, Robert Lansing, provided the President with the details of an earlier meeting he had that morning with Paul Fuller, Jr. It is at this point in which the first suggestion was made of the United States establishing a military occupation of Haiti. Fuller recommended to Lansing that a temporary occupation by U.S. military forces should be used to control government functions in order to hold an honest election and provide security.[46] Lansing also mentions in this correspondence that he was scheduled to meet with Roger Farnham as well, and it is clear that the dynamic that Farnham had established with the State Department under Bryan would not continue. Due to Bryan and the U.S. State Department's lack of knowledge of Haiti, they had been dependent on Farnham for information concerning the lay of the land. Lansing, on the other hand, had more knowledge of the area, or at the very least had enough access to information there to know not to rely on Farnham's advice.

> Mr. Farnham of the City National Bank has asked for a conference with Mr. Fuller and myself. It will take place tomorrow. I confess that I am a little suspicious as to the City Bank's attitude toward the Republic of Haiti, Certain actions taken by them are at least criticizable, I also find that Mr. Farnham, who has visited the Island several times, is not liked by the Haitian people, and that he has shown more or less arrogance in treating with them. I do not wish to be unjust to the bank, but at the same time statements in their behalf must be received with caution.[47]

[46] Arthur S. Link, et al., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, Volume 34: July 21 – September 30, 1915 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1980), 60.
[47] Ibid.

Farnham was still involved in the post-invasion conversation with the Wilson Administration over what to do with Haiti, but whatever influence he previously held was greatly diminished after Lansing replaced Bryan.

Further talk of maintaining U.S. control over Haiti continued as the situation in Port-au-Prince deteriorated. Though Lansing questioned the legality of establishing such control, he also admitted that he could not see any form of stability being secured and maintained there unless the U.S. took on an administrative role to conserve the customs and prevent their receipts by irresponsible persons.[48] To make matters worse, the civil disorder in the capital of Port-au-Prince in the aftermath of the invasion proved to be a far more pressing and immediate concern that required the U.S. to take action as quickly as possible. Due to riots in the capital, rural Haitians who normally brought their food to Port-au-Prince to sell avoided it out of fear, resulting in famine[49] Despite lacking the legal authority to take over city government in this instance, Lansing recommended that U.S. naval authorities take control over collections of customs on imports and exports in order to begin relief efforts for those living in the capital.[50]

After becoming aware of the situation in Port-au-Prince, Wilson provided a prompt response with the intention of restoring order and stability to the Haitian capital. In his reply to Secretary Lansing's briefing and recommendations, Wilson agreed with Lansing that there was little legal authority by which the U.S. could act to restore stability, but concluded that there was no other choice "but to take the bull by the horns

[48] Link, et al., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, Volume 34: July 21 – September 30, 1915, 69.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid.

and restore order".[51] Wilson then laid out three actions that for Lansing to put in motion: 1) Consult with the Secretary of the Navy to send a force large enough to control the city of Port-au-Prince and the surrounding countryside from which it would otherwise draw its food, 2) Let the present Congress that it would receive U.S. protection but would not be recognized if it put in charge of affairs men who could not be trusted to handle and put an end to revolutionary activities, and 3) That all present Haitian authorities would be made to understand that the U.S. would take steps to prevent the payment of debts that were contracted to finance revolution.[52]

Initial Reactions of the Baptist and AME Missionaries

When L. Ton Evans left Haiti to return to the United States in 1912, the Baptist mission he helped establish there did not end in his absence, nor did his work on behalf of Haiti. After four years in the field, Evans left behind over 1,000 members across 16 churches, which included 12 missionary students, 8 active missionaries that had worked under Evans' supervision, 20 native preachers or assistants, and 15 or more teachers in the mission's day schools.[53] Of the eight active missionaries that had worked under Evans, seven were native Haitians and one was a white French citizen, all of which had been educated at seminary in the United States.[54] Having left the mission field well-established there, Evans returned to the U.S. and began petitioning the U.S. government to take a more active role in curtailing the escalating violence in Haiti. While back in the

[51] Link, et al., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, Volume 34: July 21 – September 30, 1915, 78.
[52] United States Congress, 78-79.
[53] Ibid, 151.
[54] Ibid.

U.S., he maintained correspondence with the Baptist mission in Haiti, received reports on their progress through his role as honorary field secretary, and kept a close eye on U.S. policy towards Haiti through the U.S. press.[55] Though there is no evidence that President Wilson ever received any of Evans' letters or requests, the U.S. invasion of Haiti in July of 1915 occurred all the same and was greeted by Evans with predictable enthusiasm. He even went so far as to refer to the intervention as "the most momentous period in the history of the black Republic" since the discovery of Hispaniola by Columbus, and the peoples' liberation from slavery by Toussaint L'Ouverture.[56]

Another predictable response by Evans to the news of U.S. intervention in Haiti was that simply praising the U.S. government for taking action was not enough to satisfy someone who consistently embraced a hands-on approach in his mission work. Hoping to utilize his connections both within the United States and Haiti at what he perceived as a golden opportunity, Evans reached out to the Wilson administration once again in September of 1915. In his letter, Evans offered to resign his current church in Lansford, PA and his missionary status in order to take on the role of a mediator between the U.S. Marines and the Haitians in the hopes of explaining the meaning of the invasion and avoiding any conflicts between the two groups.[57] As was the case with earlier appeals, Evans' proposal to meet about such an appointment appears to have gone unacknowledged by Wilson. Despite meetings with the President's secretary, Joseph Tumulty, requesting a direct meeting with President on the matter, the reply Evans

[55] United States Congress, 159.
[56] Ibid, 160.
[57] Ibid, 159-160.

received was to write down a full proposal to be submitted to the President rather than to schedule a meeting, and while Evans did so he became convinced that "neither my first or second letter went further than Secretary Tumulty".[58]

With his appeal to act as an official intermediary between the two nations rejected, as the U.S. military intervention transitioned into an occupation, Evans returned to Haiti in late 1917 to resume missionary work. Much had changed since his departure in 1912, and not just in Haiti. Along with his destination transitioned in that time from independent, yet unstable republic to an U.S. protectorate under Marine occupation, the years between his visits saw the ignition of the First World War and, during the same year of Evans' return, U.S. entry into that conflict. His awareness of these changes was evident in his first mission report in 1918, as Evans' described his arrival in Haiti on Thanksgiving Day 1917 as having occurred safely "in spite of the war, submarines, etc.".[59] Another significant change for Evans was that this mission was sponsored by a different Baptist organization than had funded him previously. The Lott Carey Baptist Foreign Mission Society was founded as an African-American Baptist organization in 1897 with the express purpose of pursing international missions focused predominantly within Africa.[60] Just as the AME Church, who also began missionary activities focused in Africa during the 1890s, had a vested interest in the fate of Haiti as a source of black liberation and self-governance, so too did the Lott Carey Society and for the same reason.

[58] United States Congress, 160.
[59] Ibid, 161.
[60] "History," LottCarey.org, accessed December 14, 2018, http://lottcarey.org/about-us/history/.

In his initial report submitted to the Lott Carey Society, Evans described his impression of the U.S. occupation there in positive terms. Along with expressing his pleasant surprise to encounter a quiet and order in the country that had replaced the fear and anxiety that he had previously seen among the Haitian people during the period of chronic revolutions, he also described in his report the successful application of several reforms to improve the hospitals and prisons throughout the country.[61] Clearly pleased with the early results of the occupation, Evans at this stage was certainly a central proponent of the U.S. presence in Haiti.

> Such a calm and growing confidence among the natives themselves as a result of the occupation compels me to thank God, and I am sure tens of thousands of others here all over the Republic do so in silent gratitude, both to the Almighty as well as the United States Government, that at last Admiral Caperton landed our American marines that day at Port-au-Prince.[62]

However enthusiastic Evans was in the first years of the occupation, even he was aware that not everyone, including the Lott Carey Society and many in the community of African-American Baptists shared his enthusiasm. He later described one of the purposes of his 1918 report being to clear up misunderstandings and criticisms of the occupation by both white and black U.S. Baptists.[63]

Despite Evans's desire to inspire American, and particularly African-American, Baptist support for the U.S. occupation, Evans too expressed concerns about the way the occupation was being handled in its early stages. Most notably, Evans was critical of

---

[61] United States Congress, 161.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Ibid, 162.

how, in spite of the 1915 treaty between the United States and Haiti guaranteeing Haiti's integrity, protection, and liberty, had abolished the Haitian Senate and House of Representatives by military force.[64] In an intervention ostensibly meant to restore democratic order to Haiti, the forced removal of the Haitian legislature and the instatement of a Haitian President selected by the U.S. appeared even to Evans as anything but democratic. To Evans, it was a violation of the Haitian constitution, the treaty signed with the United States, and the beginning of a downward spiral in which more and more resistance to the U.S. presence there would only increase.[65] It would also be the beginning of a more personal journey for L. Ton Evans, where he soon transitioned from a vocal proponent of the U.S. intervention and occupation to an agitator against it. In a strange twist for someone who had only a few years earlier offered his services as a supportive mediator for the occupation, by the time this mission to Haiti ended, Evans found put himself at odds with his own Mission Board and with the U.S. occupation forces.

Evans' initial enthusiasm for the positive aspects of the U.S. occupation were also not shared by AME missionaries operating in Haiti during the onset. As early as October 28, 1915, AME missionary to Haiti, S.E. Churchstone Lord, wrote a letter to Secretary of State Lansing with a very different assessment of the early stages of the occupation. Rather than relative calm and the positive reforms Evans described upon his return, Lord described sluggish progress on reforms as well as incidents of brutality on the part of the

[64] United States Congress, 162.
[65] Ibid.

Marines towards the Haitian population.[66] At this point, Lord did not advocate for an outright withdrawal of U.S. forces, but rather suggested possible ways to improve reforms in Haiti. Restoring order and stability in Haiti, he believed, needed the introduction of Protestant social workers, both black and white, as well as establishing industrial schools modeled after the Tuskegee Institute, and staffed with African-American teachers.[67] Though neither Evans, Lord, or many of the African-Americans within the denominations these missionaries served viewed the more heavy-handed aspects of the early occupation as ideal, there appears to have at least been hope in the early days that the relative political stability, though undemocratically produced, would allow their missions the opportunity to pursue their evangelizing and education-based programs under better conditions than they had previously endured.

The October issue of *The A.M.E. Church Review* echoed Lord's concerns during the early months of the intervention. Despite the increasingly chaotic political situation in Haiti in the years prior to 1915, Reverend Reverdy C. Ransom described the assassination of Haitian President Sam on July 28, and the subsequent U.S. invasion, as something that had caught the A.M.E. Church by surprise.[68] Ransom continued to describe the U.S. intervention that followed, not with the enthusiasm of Evans, but rather with a grudging acceptance of its necessity. While the military control of Haiti by the U.S. was "hurtful to the nation's pride and depressing to the Afro-Americans who extol

[66] Brenda Gayle Plummer, "The Afro-American Response to the Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934," *Phylon*, Vol. 43, No. 2, 1982, 130.
[67] Plummer, "The Afro-American Response to the Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934," 130-131.
[68] Reverdy C. Ransom, "American Intervention in Haiti," *The A.M.E. Church Review*, Vol. 32, No. 1, 1915, 98.

the heroic achievements of Haiti's great men, Toussaint L'Ouverture, Dessalines, and Petion, Colombo and Geffrard", Ransom acknowledged that "many Haitians, legislators among them, hope for a new phase of life out of the American occupation".[69] Along with this acceptance and hope that the occupation would bring stability and prosperity to Haiti, even if it meant acknowledging that Haiti could not do so on its own, Ransom also seems to have shared Evans' belief that many of these problems were caused by prior German interference. Ransom accused Germany of not only of corrupt business practices that allowed many in the West Indies to starve, but also of attempting to drive a wedge between the Haiti and "her best friend, the United States, who has a greater right to share in her prosperity".[70] This likely provided a sense of comfort within the A.M.E. community in accepting U.S. help in bringing order to Haiti. If Haiti's internal problems were at least in part the result of external interference, then could she really be faulted for needing external assistance?

Like Evans and Lord, Ransom appears to have been hopeful that despite the shame of being militarily occupied, the occupation would begin improving the situation in Haiti. The presence of U.S. troops, he noted, would allow Haiti's first legitimately free election by guarding all the candidates against threats and assassinations, and that one candidate who had been imprisoned had already been released under orders by Captain Beach of the U.S. Marines.[71] Nevertheless, Ransom also looked toward the occupation with uncertainty. While breaking from Lord's reports by crediting that the Marines had

[69] Ransom, "American Intervention in Haiti," 99.
[70] Ibid.
[71] Ibid.

thus far committed no outrages against the native population, and stating his hope that the U.S. would bring tranquility and prosperity to the beleaguered republic, the Haitians still held the lingering questions "What do they want?" or "What will they take from us?".[72] Furthermore, while he did not at this early stage condemn the occupation, Ransom did hold suspicions about the motivations behind American intervention. Though admitting Haiti's recent political turmoil, he points out that several Republican journals had questioned why Wilson's government had been in such a hurry to invade Haiti when Mexico had also experienced years of political upheaval.[73] Ransom did not at this point spell out his reasoning for this, but he did conclude with optimism that the occupation would quickly put Haiti on its feet and the troops would return home. "The American government has promised to retire as soon as "order is restored," and will doubtless live up to its word", he wrote, but the benchmarks for restoring order would ultimately prove elusive as resistance to the U.S. presence grew.[74]

While U.S. missionaries in the field from both the Baptists and the AME were beginning to question the merits of having the Marines in Haiti, it is worth pointing out that the commander of the Marine forces in Haiti in 1918, Colonel John H. Russell, Jr., certainly wanted to be somewhere else. During the course of 1918, the Allies that spring had faced a massive German offensive along the Western Front that threatened to reach Paris for the first time since August 1914. U.S. troops had been slowly arriving in Europe since mobilization began the previous year, and just as the German offensive began to

[72] Ransom, "American Intervention in Haiti," 99.
[73] Ibid, 99-100.
[74] Ibid, 100.

slow down during the summer of 1918, a surge of U.S. troops arrived to bolster the Allied forces. Now on the offensive, the Allies were advancing deeper and deeper into what had been for four years German-occupied territory. As U.S. troops poured into Europe for what was sure to be the final offensive of the Great War, Col. Russell wanted to be a part of it. In August of that year, a request for a change of commander by Col. Russell was received and denied. Despite being described as anxious to be relieved of his duty in Haiti to be transferred to France, his request was denied on the grounds that the occupation in Haiti was at a critical juncture and that it would take at least six months for any potential successor to arrive in order to take command of operations there.[75] It was no doubt a disappointment for Russell that, rather than participate in the final battles of the 'War to End All Wars', he was forced to maintain order in a Caribbean country about as far from the action in Europe as one could get. Also not in doubt in that Russell was not alone among the Marines stationed in Haiti in 1918 rather than fighting with their brothers-in-arms in Europe.

Though the First World War ended in November of 1918, and U.S. troops began returning home in 1919, the Marines stationed in Haiti were not going anywhere. While fear on the part of the U.S. government over whatever threat Germany may or may not have posed in Haiti, the end of the German threat did not result in a withdrawal of the U.S. occupation. Attempts by the U.S. to develop infrastructure in Haiti and maintain order had been slow to take hold, and came up against increasing public resistance. After

[75] U.S Department of State, Ferdinand Mayer, "Change of Commander of Operation in Haiti," by Ferdinand Mayer, 838.00/1544, Washington, D.C.: August 20, 1918, 1.

the initial arrival of the U.S. forces in 1915, there had been little resistance from a population weary from years of seemingly incessant revolution. Nevertheless, Haitian history cast a shadow on public perception of the U.S. occupiers. Years had passed with U.S. troops still in control of the Haitian government and the local police force, the Gendarmerie, and more and more of the population began to resent that, over a hundred years after a bitter struggle for their independence and emancipation, the Haitian people were once again under the control of white invaders. For many Haitians, the fact that these invaders had arrived and taken over the country with hardly a shot fired against them only further rankled their national pride and sense of revolutionary identity.

As the Haitian population grew more resentful of the U.S. occupation, the support from U.S. missionaries, from the lukewarm response by S.E. Churchstone Lord to even the highly enthusiastic support given by L. Ton Evans, soon began to wane as well. By October of 1918, Evans once again reached out to the Wilson administration concerning U.S. intervention in Haiti. Only this time, rather than heaping praise for taking action, he presented a lengthy list of grievances. Lord also sent letters regarding the deteriorating condition of Haiti in the years to come. However, many of them were addressed, not to the U.S. government, but to the AME and to the NAACP in order to sway African-American public opinion concerning the occupation. As the U.S. occupation of Haiti continued, the role of U.S. Baptist and AME missionaries changed once again. Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century, they had served at times in a nonofficial capacity as intermediaries between the U.S. and Haitian governments as well as African-Americans seeking emigration. At this stage, they were now in the unfamiliar

role of working against the current U.S. policy in Haiti and in turning both political support, and African-American public opinion, against it.

CHAPTER V

BUYERS' REMORSE: U.S. MISSIONARY RESISTANCE TO THE OCCUPATION

Prior to, and at the early onset of, the U.S. occupation of Haiti, U.S. missionaries L. Ton Evans and S.E. Churchstone Lord were active in trying to influence U.S. government policy towards Haiti, but their impact appears to have been negligible at best. Evans certainly made an effort to convince the Wilson administration to intervene in Haiti, but the evidence suggests that his input had little to no bearing on their decision once it was made. Lord's attempt to appeal for reform to Secretary of State Lansing in 1915 met with equal dismissal by the U.S. government, yet he was successful in beginning to shape the opinion of African-American organizations, such as the NAACP, of the occupation early on. Though they failed to measurably impact U.S. policy towards Haiti prior to 1918, that significantly changed afterward. The primary catalyst for Evans and Lord shifting their roles as missionaries yet again from actively engaging the U.S. administration of the occupation to outright opposing it politically and publicly was the decision by the occupational administration to reinstitute the corvée. The forced dissolution of the Haitian legislature was also a significant factor in generating missionary criticism of the occupation, but it was the imposition of the corvée on the Haitians that ultimately made them antagonistic towards it. This largely obsolete Haitian

policy of using coerced labor for agricultural and infrastructure projects was resurrected by the U.S. in 1917, leading to abuses of the native population. This not only soured the image of the U.S. occupation in the eyes of the Haitian people but proved to be the impetus for missionary resistance against U.S. policy in Haiti.

Early Missteps of the Occupation

By September of 1915, an official treaty was signed between the Republic of Haiti and the United States of America, which ironed out the goals of the military occupation. In the *Treaty Between the United States and Haiti Concerning the Finances, Economic Development and Tranquility of Haiti*, the U.S. stated within its sixteen articles the goals of developing Haiti's agricultural, mineral and commercial resources, the stabilization and management of the customs houses, managing and settling Haiti debt, establishing the Gendarmerie as a police force made up of Haitians lead by American commanders, and the prohibition of selling or ceding territory or entering agreements with foreign powers that might impair Haitian independence.[1] Almost immediately there were problems that persisted over the next nineteen years for which the United States remained engaged in Haitian governance. Setting the stage for criticisms that Haiti under U.S. rule was even more authoritarian than it had been under previous chronic successions of despotic leadership, the U.S. government forced the Haitian legislature to elect a pro-U.S. President, Phillippe Sudre Dartiguenave, even before the treaty was finalized.

[1] U.S. Department of State, *Charge Davis to the Secretary of State, American Legation, Port-au-Prince, September 21, 1915*, R.B. Davis. Washington, D.C.: Foreign Relations of the United States, September 21, 1915, 448-451 http://images.library.wisc.edu/FRUS/EFacs/1915/reference/frus.frus1915.i0022.

Accounts by Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels serve as an example of how the U.S. occupation of Haiti also had to contend with racial attitudes held by those overseeing the occupation. In response to the famine in Port-au-Prince in the days following the invasion, Daniels's advice to Admiral Caperton to get the Haitians to organize a relief committee to obtain supplies at Navy prices was followed by the suggestion to discourage supplying them directly based on his belief that, "many Haitiens are like the negroes of the South after the (Civil) war and would quit work entirely, deserting plantations if our Government undertakes to feed them."[2]

Views such as this were certainly not limited to Daniels. Former West Virginia Governor MacCorkle, whom had advocated earlier for U.S. intervention, stated in his 1914 address to the American Academy of Political and Social Science his beliefs over how Haiti's chronic and worsening political instability were the result of the absence of white leadership. The Wilson Administration operated under what it perceived to be a strategic as well as moral imperative to intervene, but that morality was couched in a belief of racial superiority. Paternalist discourse about how it was the job of white masters to take care of and civilize blacks had survived the end of slavery and continued to be applied in the form of "white man's burden" as the U.S. gained overseas territories at the turn of the century.

This certainly was applied to the Haiti situation and, with this psychology, the United States and Wilson in particular believed it was morally obligated to stabilize and secure Haiti, because the Haitians could not be expected to do it themselves. Whatever

[2] Link, et al., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, Volume 34: July 21 – September 30, 1915, 61.

pretext the First World War offered as to why the United States was strategically required to intervene in Haiti, this particular brand of morality on the part of Wilson caused the occupation to last longer than even key figures in his administration felt it should have. In his memoirs, Daniels recounted what he calls "Overstayed Time in Haiti", where he reaffirmed his belief that the fear of Germany establishing U-boat bases in Haiti and Santo Domingo, and that political instability in Haiti in particular, were the initial motivations that forced the Wilson administration to act.[3] However, Daniels went on to express doubts after the occupation continued well past the war. After the Armistice was signed, Daniels recounted how he urged the Administration to withdraw from Haiti and restore its independence now that the threat of Germany was no longer a conceivable issue, and how disappointed he was that the United States maintained its occupation anyway.[4] Believing the Wilson administration had become too imperialistic, Daniels stated after the end of the occupation in 1934 that he "rejoiced later when a commission led the way to doing in Harding's administration what I urged should be done before the end of the Wilson Administration."[5] The commission he referred to was the 1920 Naval investigation into the alleged abuses of the Haitian population, which were eventually brought to U.S. political and public attention by U.S. missionaries. This investigation by the Navy was followed in 1921 by the U.S. Senate hearings on the matter.

[3] Josephus Daniels, *The Wilson Era: Years of Peace, 1910-1917* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1944), 178.
[4] Ibid, 179.
[5] Ibid.

Further resistance followed as the U.S. continued to expand its control over the Haitian government. After being instructed to do so by the State Department, Admiral Caperton between August 21 and September 2, 1915 seized the customs houses of ten principal ports.[6] This gave complete financial control of the Haitian government to the U.S. Navy as, for several months afterward, all customs dues, which served as practically the sole source of national revenue were collected by naval officers and deposited in accounts in Admiral Caperton's name.[7] Unsurprisingly, the Haitian legislature reacted negatively to the seizure of the customs houses, and strongly protested these actions. At this point both the Haitian President and Cabinet threatened to resign, which was countered with Caperton's recommendation that, in the event of the resignation of the Haitian government, a military government would be established with an American officer acting as military governor.[8] The government remained intact at this time, but American military control of the country expanded all the same. On September 3, 1915, Admiral Caperton declared martial law putting all the country's security forces and finances under the direct control of the Department of the Navy with the expressed purpose of supporting "the Haitian situation until affairs of the country are set at right and predominant interests of the United States of America secured".[9]

Tensions between the U.S. occupation and the Haitian legislature came to a head in 1917 as President Wilson pushed forward on creating a new constitution for Haiti. In

---

[6] Frederick Bausman, et al., *The Seizure of Haiti by the United States: A Report on the Military Occupation of the Republic of Haiti and the History of the Treaty Forced Upon Her* (New York: The Foreign Policy Association, 1922), 8.
[7] Ibid.
[8] Ibid, 9.
[9] Ibid.

this new constitution, the law banning foreigners from owning property in Haiti, which had served as a protective measure against foreign control since the country had first gained its independence, was removed.[10] This would allow U.S. businesses to operate more freely within Haiti, and while the U.S. perspective was that this would help support infrastructure and economic development in Haiti, the perspective of the Haitian nationalists was that the freedom from foreign, and particularly white, rule for which their ancestors had fought was unraveling before their very eyes. The Haitian legislature responded by rejecting the proposed constitution and drafting their own new constitution that was far more contrary to U.S. interests.[11] The U.S. response removed opposition within the Haitian government, but in a way that only strengthened opposition among the population. President Dartiguenave, under direction by the U.S. government, dissolved the legislature and thereby removed political opposition to U.S. rule there until the legislature was later restored in 1929.[12]

L. Ton Evans and Occupation Opposition

Based on recent historiography, there appears to have been an assumption, at least on the part of the U.S. government and military, that U.S. Protestant missionaries would serve as a support of U.S. administration there. Patrick Bellegarde-Smith states that Protestant missions were encouraged by the occupation as part of a Progressive program to change Haitian society and institutions.[13] Part of this encouragement was based on the

[10] "MILESTONES 1914-1920."
[11] Ibid.
[12] Ibid.
[13] Patrick Bellegarde-Smith, Alex Dupuy, Robert Fatton Jr., Mary Renda, Ermitte St. Jacques and Jeffrey Sommers, "Haiti and Its Occupation by the United States in 1915: Antecedents and Outcomes." *Journal of Haitian Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 2, Special Issue on the US Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934 (Fall 2015), 25.

suppression of the local religion of voudou, which occupation forces viewed as a key component of Haitian resistance to the U.S. presence.[14] While this view on the part of the occupation forces fits with how U.S. missionaries in the early twentieth century have been viewed in the historiography, the actions of L. Ton Evans and S.E. Churchstone Lord conflict with that assessment.

The dissolving of the Haitian legislature appears to mark the turning point in which L. Ton Evans' support for the U.S. occupation begins to wane. Still confident in the perceived noble intentions of President Wilson and the U.S. government to bring order and prosperity to Haiti, Evans in the fall of 1918 again began to petition the President on Haiti's behalf. Utilizing his connections within Haitian government and society, Evans, along with three thousand leading and influential Haitian citizens, put together and signed a petition citing specific grievances against how the occupation had been handled to date, and providing suggestions to address these grievances.[15] At this stage, Evans was very cordial in his language and was still optimistic that the Wilson Administration still had Haiti's best interests at heart. He began the preamble of the petition with a reiteration of his personal gratitude, which he claimed was "shared in alike-by every loyal and patriotic Haitian, both educated, and uneducated", for the arrival of the Marines in 1915 which ended German interference in Haitian affairs and produced "splendid work" in the restoration of order in the country.[16] One can imagine that this

[14] Chantalle F. Verna, *Haiti and the Uses of America: Post-U.S. Occupation Promises* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2017), 46.
[15] U.S. Department of State, *Memorandum to the Honorable Woodrow Wilson*, 4.
[16] Ibid, 1.

minister's writing to Wilson perhaps deliberately followed the style of the letters to the Seven Churches found in the Book of Revelation that begin with praise for what was going right before digressing into "But this I have against you".

The first set of grievances listed within the petition referred to the dissolution of the Haitian legislature and how this act, as well as other actions taken to silence opposition to the occupation, violated the terms of the 1915 treaty. Along with "the forcing of a new Constitution upon the people under "military pressure" by armed gendarmes (native police)", the forced removal of the "Haitian peoples' only representative bodies", and the allowance of Haitian land to become the property of (white) foreigners, the Haitian judiciary had also been overridden:

> The casting into prisons of Judges, Officials, educated and enlightened Haitians on mere suspicion, flimsy and unsupported charges of political rivals, or personal enemies it is alleged, and that without any chance of appeal, as Courts and Judges who remain, as well as President, and National Council are directly under the jurisdiction of the "American Occupation".[17]

The prospect that all three branches of the Haitian government existed under the complete domination of a foreign military force was presented as a threat as much to U.S. ideals of democracy as it was to Haitian sovereignty. As global democratization was a centerpiece of Wilson's Fourteen Points, Evans no doubt hoped that this presentation of the situation would grab the President's attention. Nevertheless, Evans stopped short of directly pointing out the contradiction in Wilson's ideals and policies as they pertained to

[17] U.S. Department of State, *Memorandum to the Honorable Woodrow Wilson*, 2-3.

Haiti. The reverent language he used throughout this memorandum suggests Evans fervently believed Wilson would intervene if only he was made aware of these problems.

The next grievance listed in the petition dealt, however, with an even more serious allegation, and one which Evans himself experienced first-hand only months later. Worse in terms of actions that ultimately turned the Haitian population against the U.S. occupation were increasing reports of abuse of civilians by military forces, either by the native Gendarmes or to certain Marine officers to which they ultimately answered. Another U.S. Protestant missionary who worked throughout the Caribbean and Latin American region, Samuel G. Inman, described the U.S. Marine officers with the Gendarmerie as "clothed with practically unlimited power, in the district where he serves".[18] Speaking to the use of that power, Evans' petition references:

> The taking through force, and much brutality leading to frequent murders by ignorant, immoral and drunken "armed gendarmes" in the employment of our "Occupation" of innocent men, and women; even members and native preachers from their simple homes and small habitations (farms) while at their work, going on business, and on the way to Divine Worship, cruelly roping them tightly together and marching same as African slave gangs to prison, etc.[19]

As a minister with a reputation back in Cadoxton, Wales of being a leading advocate of temperance, it is unsurprising that Evans found the drunkenness of the occupying forces to be the central problem. Furthermore, Evans' account of persistent problems with alcohol consumption by occupation forces is supported by multiple reports, as well as

[18] Leon D. Pamphile. *Contrary Destinies: A Century of America's Occupation, Deoccupation, and Reoccupation of Haiti* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2015), 29.
[19] U.S. Department of State, *Memorandum to the Honorable Woodrow Wilson*, 3.

actions taken by Col. Russell himself to try to address the issue. Evans even makes a point to extend the benefit of the doubt to the Marines in noting that Col. Russell, having become aware of how pervasive the consumption of alcohol was for white Marine and native Gendarme alike, had recently issued a proclamation prohibiting the sale of alcohol to those under his command, and attached severe penalties for future infractions.[20]

Even more significant is what this grievance suggests about the relationship between Baptist missionaries, Haitian Baptists in general and the U.S. administration of Haiti. If members of his own churches in Haiti, as well as native preachers, were by 1918 becoming targets in these instances, then Evans is not merely a lone voice of discontent within the regional Baptist community. Furthermore, the allegation that intoxicated soldiers paraded their victims through the streets like "African slave gangs" also demonstrates that the attitudes of racial superiority that were present within the high-ranking administrators of the occupation were present at all levels. In terms of the role of U.S. Baptist missionaries during the occupation of Haiti, what this grievance signifies is the beginning of a shift in which they became less intermediaries between the U.S. government and the Haitians, and more active advocates on the Haitians' behalf in opposition to the occupation.

Nevertheless, at the time this petition was written, the assumption on the part of Evans was still that all of these issues were happening in spite of Wilson's noble intentions. The conclusion of the preamble included his belief that all of these administrative blunders and acts of violence were "actually committed without the

[20] U.S. Department of State, *Memorandum to the Honorable Woodrow Wilson*, 3.

knowledge, and therefore the sanction, and authority of either our President, and responsible United States Government".[21] Still optimistic that, upon being alerted to these issues, the U.S. government would take steps to correct these issues, the petition included suggestions on how best to address the problems at hand. The suggested solutions included taking steps such as not to increase the public debt of Haiti, that the U.S. government and possibly with the help of either the Rockefeller and/or Carnegie foundations provide financial support for the establishment of a National Industrial College, that this College would provide the public with free and compulsory education, that all agricultural, material, and industrial projects in Haiti should remain under the control of the U.S. government and not delegated to individuals or corporations with other interests, and the end of forced labor with the exception of prisoners.[22] This last point was another key aspect of public opposition in Haiti to the U.S. occupation, as it refers to the attempt by the U.S. to streamline infrastructure development in Haiti by reinstating the corvée. This practice of coerced manual labor is referenced among Evans' grievances:

> The arresting of natives in large numbers at their homes, on their small farms, or on the roads, and by force taking them to work on new roads miles away, under "armed gendarmes" and for rarely a gourde (twenty American cents) a week: and without food it is affirmed by the natives and corroborated by the gendarmes.[23]

[21] U.S. Department of State, *Memorandum to the Honorable Woodrow Wilson*, 1.
[22] Ibid, 3-4.
[23] Ibid, 3.

From the U.S. perspective the practice was rationalized as using a preexisting, though traditionally controversial, Haitian labor practice that had been previously used in their history to improve infrastructure. However, although they were being paid for this labor, it was low wages and coerced labor all the same. This practice had never been well received when Haitian leaders such as Toussaint L'Ouverture had employed it in the past as it was often viewed as at least a partial return to the slave labor from which the nation had won its independence. The fact that this involuntary labor was being forced on people at will by a foreign, white military force did little to convince Haitians that slavery had not somehow returned after all this time.

As far as President Wilson's personal reaction to the petition, that will likely remain in the realm of the hypothetical as U.S. government correspondence indicates that he never received the document in question. After composing the memorandum for President Wilson, Evans forwarded it to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in hopes of gaining their support for the industrial school, while also forwarding a copy to the Executive Committee for the National Race Congress.[24] The Carnegie Endowment later returned the memorandum to Evans after several months of consideration, however, the National Race Congress ordered several copies to be made in order to make conditions in Haiti more widely known.[25] This is turn persuaded J. Milton Waldron, head of the NAACP Washington Branch and Baptist Minister, to write his own letter to the President. In his letter to Wilson, Waldron referred to the state of the occupation in Haiti

[24] U.S. Department of State, *Memorandum to the Honorable Woodrow Wilson*, 4.
[25] Ibid.

as “intolerable and appalling”, and requested a fifteen minute meeting with the President to discuss the possibility of forming a “Committee of Seven Representative men of the race from several sections of our country, who are interested in the welfare of the Island Republic” that could evaluate and propose solutions to the issues currently being faced.[26] Evans too had suggested the assembly of a commission in his memorandum to further study and evaluate the Haiti situation, and his report and suggestions were now being echoed within the NAACP. This demonstrates that Evans’ activities at that time were beginning to make an impact. Though Evans’s efforts did not yet directly impact U.S. government policy towards Haiti, they indirectly did so by influencing members of religious and race-focused organizations to put pressure on the Wilson administration.

Neither Evans or Waldron would get the opportunity to appeal directly to President Wilson. In correspondence between the U.S. Minister to Haiti, Arthur Bailly-Blanchard, and the State Department, while copies of the Evans memorandum are said to have been transmitted to the Department of the Navy and Legation at Port-au-Prince, Bailly-Blanchard described it as “hardly worth the paper on which it is written” and his grievances were dismissed as “incorrect and most of them give an entirely wrong impression”.[27] Bailly-Blanchard did, however, acknowledge instances of abuse and the use of the corvée, and countered that this issue had already been addressed.

> There have been undoubtedly isolated cases of cruelty by the Gendarmerie, who are native policemen of the same illiterate type mentioned about, but I am certain

[26] U.S. Department of State, *Waldron Letter to President Wilson, November 6. 1918*, by J. Milton Waldron, 838.00/1548, Washington, D.C.: 1918.
[27] U.S. Department of State, Division of Latin-American Affairs, *Memorandum*, by Arthur Bailly-Blanchard, 838.00/1547, Washington, D.C.: 1918, 1-2.

> that these incidents when discovered have been properly punished, and such incidents in a country like Haiti are simply unavoidable. The Corvée which I suppose Mr. Evans means by his word "Corfu" has been abolished.[28]

As for Rev. Waldron's request for a meeting, he fared no better at getting past the President's secretary than Evans previously had.

In a letter between Secretary of State, Robert Lansing, and Presidential Secretary, Joseph Tumulty, the concerns of both Waldron and Evans are summarily dismissed. In his recommendation that a meeting between Waldron and the President "would serve no useful purpose", Lansing described Waldron's characterization of the occupation in Haiti as "very misleading, constituting altogether an apparent misrepresentation of the splendid work and altruistic efforts of American officials in Haiti".[29] Waldron never got his meeting with President Wilson, as the State Department considered the matter of the occupation, and its merits, closed. The matter of the government's response to L. Ton Evans himself, however, was another story as Lansing concluded his letter with a recommendation that harkened back to a question posed centuries earlier by King Henry II concerning Archbishop Thomas Becket: "Will no one rid me of this turbulent priest?" Stating that "I cannot but feel that Mr. Evans is only a misinformed reformer who is seeking to stir up a great deal of unnecessary trouble", Lansing indicated that he had already acquired a confidential report concerning L. Ton Evans from the Bureau of War Trade Intelligence, and had distributed copies of Evans' memorandum to the Department

[28] U.S. Department of State, Division of Latin-American Affairs, *Memorandum*, 2.
[29] U.S Department of State, *Letter from Lansing to Tumulty, November 4, 1918*, by Robert Lansing, 838.00/1547, Washington, D.C.: 1918, 1.

of the Navy and the Legation in Port-au-Prince.[30] Evans' grievances had been dismissed but, in a way very different than what he had hoped, he had all the same managed to get the Administration's attention.

For Evans, the principle threat to Haitian stability had always been German interference, and, despite certain missteps, the U.S. occupation of Haiti and eventual entry into the Great War had brought that threat to an end. The armistice in November 1918 had effectively brought the war to an end and with it, in Evans mind, the need for a U.S. military occupation. Within days of the declaration of the Armistice, a still enthusiastic and undeterred Evans wrote to President Wilson in hopes that peace would bring U.S. attention back to fixing the issues of the Haiti occupation. With Germany defeated, and Germans in Haiti having been interned following Haiti's declaration of war in 1918, Evans respectfully suggested that all political prisoners under the occupation should be set free, and that the military occupation should now be replaced by a "Civil Occupation", leaving the military presence to function solely as a police force.[31] While military control of the occupation, and some of the more heavy-handed incidents which had occurred under it, were elements that Evans could rationalize as part of wartime measures, they no longer seemed necessary in peacetime. Evans concluded this letter with the hope that the President would respond to the situation quickly, and that his response would arrive before Evans had to leave for the city of Saint Marc.[32] This letter

[30] U.S Department of State, *Letter from Lansing to Tumulty*, 2.
[31] U.S. Department of State, *Letter from Evans to Wilson, November 18, 1918*, by L. Ton Evans, 838.00/1549, Washington, D.C.: 1918, 1.
[32] Ibid.

was the last time Evans appealed to the Wilson administration believing that it had the interests of the Haitian people at heart.

Additional correspondence within State Department records confirm that Baptist and AME missionaries were not alone in their frustrations over the conduct of the U.S. occupation. Entitled "Conditions in Haiti", a letter was sent on September 17 to the Latin American Division concerning grievances voiced by Monseigneur Keruzan, the Catholic Bishop of North Haiti. Striking a tone like the one Evans had previously, Bishop Keruzan stressed "that he was of all things a friend and supporter of the American Occupation and his remarks were to be construed as efforts to assist and not complaints".[33] Nevertheless, the Catholic community in Haiti presented a list of problems stemming from the occupation that echoed the grievances of the Baptist community. While he stressed that resentment to the occupation in the beginning was limited to Haitian politicians and elites who viewed it as a national embarrassment, this had now expanded to "universal anger and resentment against the Americans" primarily because of the corvée.[34] Keruzan's account also supports the position of the U.S. government that, while acts of brutality against the Haitian population had occurred, that the majority of these instances took place under the native Gendarmes and not the U.S. Marines. This did not spare the U.S. from blame, however, as Keruzan pointed out that the people's anger was directed at the Americans, whom they felt should have prevented these abuses by the Gendarmes who

[33] U.S. Department of State, *Conditions in Haiti, September 17, 1918*, by Jordan Herbert Stabler, 838.00/1550, Washington, D.C.: 1918, 1.
[34] U.S. Department of State, *Bishop Keruzan to Robert Lansing, September 17, 1918*, by Monseigneur Keruzan, 838.00/1551, Washington, D.C.: 1918, 1.

served under them.[35] Furthermore, Keruzan pointed out that the enforcement of the corvée "by the authority of the whites, seem to them (Haitians) as a species of slavery" only added to this growing resentment.[36]

It is important to note that Evans, while having represented the Baptist denomination in Haiti up to this point, and had been previously viewed in lockstep with the denomination as a whole, his activities in Haiti by 1918 had created a significant divide between the individual missionary and the religious institution which he served. While more than one denomination active in Haiti expressed concerns over the conduct of the occupation, Evans was the most outspoken in lobbying his criticisms directly to Washington. According to historian Brandon Boyd, many Black Baptist leaders promoted the occupation as a unique opportunity to engage and uplift Haitians in spite of reports of abuses and were discussing mission options at the National Baptist Convention in 1917.[37] This included members of the Lott Carey Board and, by November of 1918, the U.S. government, as well as members of the Baptist board that had funded Evans' mission to Haiti, had grown tired of his political activism. Earlier in August of that year, the U.S. Postal Censorship of New York reported to the War Department on correspondence between A.M. Moore and L. Ton Evans. As cofounder of the North Carolina Mutual and Provident Association and member of the Lott Carey Missionary Convention, Dr. Moore

[35] U.S. Department of State, *Bishop Keruzan to Robert Lansing*, 2.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Brandon R. Byrd, "To Start Something to Help These People": African American Women and the Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934." *Journal of Haitian Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 2, Special Issue on the US Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934 (Fall 2015), 162-163.

wrote on behalf of the Convention to Evans asking that he desist from political agitation and resume work on the original mission scope.

Moore admonished Evans for failing to report on the work conducted since his arrival in Haiti over eight months earlier, failing to conduct an inspection tour of each of the mission fields and make recommendations, and for failing to report on the school work at St. Marc.[38] As Moore's own letter of grievances continued, he revealed that his greatest concerns, and those of the Mission Board, had less to do with poor reporting, or even failing to share in the Board's belief in the potential mission opportunities of the occupation, as they did with external pressure from the U.S. government. Wartime measures under the Wilson administration had led to censorship and penalization of speech that could be considered anti-war or anti-American, and Moore's chastisement of Evans suggests that the Lott Carey Board had come under scrutiny as a result of Evans's petitioning.

> Our good doctor Alexander has been called in question regarding your political activity in trying to shape the policy of Haiti, and opposing an insinuating remark and even a letter to the president that the United States is seeking to take the advantage of Haiti and rob the people of their native land, and I understand that your letter was of a threatening character to the President.[39]

It should be restated that the language Evans used in his communications to Wilson was respectful, and often giving Wilson the benefit of the doubt concerning reported abuses in Haiti. With that in mind, what Moore described as "threatening" in Evans's writing

[38] U.S Department of State, *Letter from Moore to Evans, August 2, 1918*, by A.M. Moore, 838.00/1553, Washington, D.C.: 1918, 1.
[39] Ibid.

should be reinterpreted as "critical", as war-time measures in the U.S. equated criticism of the government with threats. Adding to the complexity of the issue was Moore's belief that Evans's activities had put the African-American community in a precarious position. In a time when the Wilson administration was cracking down on what it considered to be "hyphenated Americans", Moore reiterated to Evans that "the American Negro stands loyally behind the President and his action in shaping the destiny of Haiti".[40]

Presumably, Moore's letter was the impetus for Reverend Evans's trip to St. Marc months later. For Evans's part, he was convinced that the criticism that he received from the Lott Carey Mission Board concerning his activities in Haiti was the result of intimidation by the State Department in collusion with certain Marine officers in Haiti, who had intercepted his private letters.[41] Apparently, one Marine officer in particular became especially irritated with Evans's attempts to preach on the Haitians' behalf, and it was with this individual that Evans's interaction with the occupation forces took a dramatic turn. In December of 1918, Evans was arrested and detained by the U.S. Marines in St. Marc. What preempted this event is not clear, but Evans later described the incident before the U.S. Senate in 1921. Evans described how at least one American marine, a Capt. Kenny whom had been known for his brutality against the natives there, had come to see the error of his ways and gave Evans an official permit to preach at the prison there.[42] Kenny was not alone, as several of the gendarmes stationed there began to show interest in Evans's preaching, but Kenny was soon replaced by a recently promoted

[40] U.S. Department of State, *Letter from Moore to Evans,* 1.
[41] United States Congress, 169.
[42] Ibid, 248.

Capt. Fizgerald Brown.[43] Capt. Brown was not nearly as enthusiastic about Evans's activities there and, allegedly in an intoxicated state at the time, arrested Evans without a warrant for trying to, as Brown allegedly put it, "Christianize and mentally and morally develop these low damned niggers".[44]

Though Evans' incarceration in St. Marc only lasted from "the closing days of 1918" to the "opening days of 1919", he described his time there as having been under strict confinement where no church members or officers were able to visit him.[45] While there, Evans later reported witnessing excessive brutality on the part of Capt. Brown and the gendarmes who were under his command towards the other prisoners. Along with overhearing "the white, intoxicated, and raging, cursing American marine" (Capt. Brown) dragging other prisoners before firing squads, Evans also reported fatal beatings of native prisoners by the gendarmes that he claimed were later displayed "perfectly nude and covered with vermin" for male and female prisoners and corvée workers to see.[46] Regardless of whatever else Captain Brown and his men may have been guilty of, the Haitian High Court soon determined that Evans's arrest and incarceration had been unwarranted. The court ruled that Evans's arrest had been illegal and decreed an indemnity "for torture and agony suffered", prompting his immediate release.[47] From this point forward, L. Ton Evans no longer sought to reform the American occupation. He was convinced that his role now was to try to bring it to an end.

---

[43] United States Congress, 249.
[44] Ibid, 207.
[45] Ibid, 246.
[46] Ibid, 247.
[47] Ibid.

The AME and African-American Public Opinion

The initial reactions of the A.M.E. Church to the American occupation were cautiously optimistic. Though begrudging of its necessity, and somewhat suspicious of the government's motivations, Rev. Ransom of *The A.M.E. Church Review* was hopeful that the occupation would be both beneficial to the Haitians and short-lived. A.M.E. missionary to Haiti, S.E. Churchstone Lord, had also been hopeful of the potential benefits of the occupation to the Haitian people. Yet, like Evans, he saw problems early on concerning U.S. administration of the Haitian government as well as interactions between the occupation forces and the native population. Furthermore, Lord had an acquaintance in W.E.B. Du Bois whom was far less optimistic about U.S. intentions there. In the September 1915 issue of the NAACP journal *The Crisis*, Du Bois lamented the occupation of Haiti and encouraged his readers to save the nation of Haiti.[48] Exalting Haiti as the nation who first led the world "out of the hell of slavery", Du Bois blamed the country's history of instability on its lack of capital, and corrupt leaders whom had "robbed her shamefully", both of which he blamed on direct or indirect European interference.[49] He clearly did not expect the U.S. to act any differently once it had gained control of the country. Du Bois appealed to his readers to help Haiti "rid herself of thieves and not try to fasten American thieves on her.[50]

[48] W.E. Burghardt Du Bois, "Hayti," *The Crisis*, Vol. 10, No. 5 (New York: National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1915), 232.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid.

As he concluded his article on the recent occupation of Haiti, Du Bois presented a recommendation for the occupational administration that contained familiar elements:

> The time calls for a Haytian Commission of white and colored men appointed by the President to co-operate with Hayti in establishing permanent peace and in assuring our stricken sister that the United States respects and will always respect her political integrity.[51]

The fact that both S.E. Churchstone Lord and W.E.B. Du Bois suggested a biracial commission to administer the occupation is unlikely to have been a coincidence. That the two knew each other is not in question. Writing from Port-au-Prince, Lord wrote a letter on February 25, 1918 wishing Du Bois a happy fiftieth birthday, as well as including payment for the renewal of his subscriptions to both *The Crisis* and *The A.M.E. Church Review*.[52] The interconnectedness of Lord to Du Bois and both journals grew over time as the occupation continued and their initial misgivings about it appeared to be confirmed.

By 1920 the patience of the A.M.E. Church with the conduct of the occupation of Haiti had worn thin. In the General Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church held in St. Louis between May 3rd and 18th of that year, as field agent to Haiti, Lord presented a resolution, which was passed, that the conference would ask Congressman Dyer of the 12th Congressional District to appeal to Congress about withdrawing American forces from Haiti.[53] That same year, James Weldon Johnson

---

[51] Du Bois, "Hayti," 232.
[52] S. E. Churchstone Lord, *Congratulating Du Bois on his 50th Birthday*, W. E. B. Du Bois Papers, (MS 312) Special Collections and University Libraries, University of Massachusetts Amherst Libraries. http://credo.library.umass.edu/view/full/mums312-b012-i087.
[53] General Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journal of the Twenty-Sixth Quadrennial Session of the General Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church Held in St. Louis, Missouri, May 3rd to 18th, 1920* (Nashville: A.M.E. Sunday School Union, 1922), 105.

wrote his report for the NAACP, *Self-Determining Haiti*, in which he describes the horrors of the corvée:

> Haitians were seized and forcibly taken to toil for months in far sections of the country. Those who protested or resisted were beaten into submission. At night, after long hours of unremitting labor under armed taskmasters, who swiftly discouraged any slackening of effort with boot or rifle butt, the victims were herded in compounds. Those attempting escape were shot. Their terror-stricken families meanwhile were often in total ignorance of the fate of their husbands, fathers, brothers.[54]

Along with appealing to the A.M.E. Church and the U.S. government to end the occupation, Lord had also become the eyes and ears of Du Bois in Haiti and had been keeping him aware of the situation there. With the end of Wilson's presidency in 1921, and the election of Republican candidate Warren G. Harding, the new administration began reevaluating the occupation. During the campaign, Harding was critical of Wilson's interventionism in places like Haiti, and after his election put the six-year long military occupation under greater government scrutiny. Writing for *Voice of Missions*, Du Bois featured Lord's report on the Haitian situation in the 1922 issue of *The Crisis*, in which he described continued abuses by the American forces stationed in Haiti, particularly against Haitian women, and expressed doubt about previously held assumptions that the U.S. invasion was the result of trying to save Haiti from Germany.[55] Lord, well past believing that a biracial commission could reform the occupation, now

---

[54] James Weldon Johnson, *Self-Determining Haiti*: *Four Articles Reprinted from "The Nation" Embodying a Report of an Investigation Made for The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People* (Forgotten Books, 2015), 13-14.
[55] W.E.B. Du Bois, "More Light on the Haitian Situation", *The Crisis*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (New York: National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1922), 39.

appealed to readers that "Every honest American who does not believe in lynching Negroes and depriving them of their political rights will urge President Harding to take his military boys home".[56] The timing of this appeal coincided with the Harding administration's decision to put the occupation itself on trial.

The Occupation Under Scrutiny

It is at this point that we see the U.S. missionaries making a direct impact, not only on public opinion concerning the occupation, but on the U.S. government had how it conducted its policy towards Haiti. On August 5, 1921 the U.S. Senate began an official inquiry into the occupations of both Haiti and the Dominican Republic. Several groups including the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Haiti-Santo Domingo Independence Society, and the Union Patriotique d'Haiti had petitioned the government to bring an end to the occupation and to address the alleged abuses of the native population. One prominent witness that was called to testify before the Senate was Rev. L. Ton Evans. The circumstances of his arrest and subsequent release had created something of a sensation. After being forced by the court in St. Marc to release Evans, Captain Brown, rather than follow the court orders to release him and provide military protection for his local missions, apparently colluded with a Major Wells to have him sent to Gonaives to stand trial once again.[57] According to Evans's testimony, Maj. Wells, Capt. Brown, and a General Williams were involved in a conspiracy to have him in prison and out of their way.[58] Upon his arrival, Evans reportedly found himself once

[56] Du Bois, "More Light on the Haitian Situation," 39.
[57] United States Congress, 247-248.
[58] Ibid, 248.

again facing a Haitian judge with a U.S. marine pressing for his incarceration. This time, the officer in question was Lt. Hange, whom Evans also described as intoxicated, and consequently had been disciplined 18 months prior by Col. Russell for drunkenness and unworthy conduct but had been reinstated by Gen. Williams and Maj. Wells.[59] Evans implied that Lt. Hange was part of this group of officers responsible for abuses against the populace whom wanted him silenced.

This second trial brought the issue to an end not only for Evans, but the officers in question. Evans described Lt. Hange as being unhinged as he is said to have threatened Evans at gunpoint during the trial, while cursing God and missionaries in general, against ever preaching in the north of Haiti again.[60] Despite these angry threats by the lieutenant, the court did not follow through with a guilty verdict. After several witnesses testified on Evans' behalf as to the baselessness of the arrest, the Haitian court dismissed the case and apparently news of what had occurred in St. Marc had reached up the chain of command resulting in a crackdown on "conduct subversive to the occupation".[61] In spite of his ordeal, Evans had managed to force needed changes to how the occupation was being conducted on the local level. At least in St. Marc, those responsible for local abuses came under greater scrutiny. In many ways, Evans' impact on the occupation was greater as an inmate than as a missionary.

Even after facing imprisonment for preaching against the conduct of the occupation, Evans nevertheless continued to appeal directly to the U.S. government. On

[59] United States Congress, 248.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Ibid.

March 27, 1920, Evans wrote to the Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, reporting that the conditions in Haiti of which he had written to Assistant Secretary of State, Alvey Adee, just before being arrested in St. Marc had only gotten worse, and Adee's promise to look into these matters remained unfulfilled seventeen months later.[62] Daniels launched an inquiry into the state of the occupation, partially because he had grown skeptical by that point of the motivations behind the initial intervention but also because Harding had made Wilson's invasion and occupation of Haiti a campaign issue. Just before the election, then-Senator Harding directed Daniels to quickly launch his inquiry while other Republican leaders were compiling evidence that would greatly expand the inquiry's scope.[63] This inquiry soon evolved into a full-blown Senate hearing.

Some of the evidence that the Republicans used to push the committee hearings forward certainly had to have come from Evans himself. After failing to make any progress appealing to the Wilson administration in 1918, Evans reached out that November to former Republican President, and staunch rival of Woodrow Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, whom advised him to reach out to the Republican Party concerning the administration's handling of Haiti.[64] Evans's arrest and incarceration shortly thereafter no doubt gave him time and further reason to think about what he would write, as he first reached out to Pennsylvania Senator Philander Knox shortly after his release. On January 22, 1919, wrote a lengthy letter to Senator Knox detailing his personal abuse and false arrest at the hands of Capt. Brown as well as the abuses against the Haitian

[62] United States Congress, 261.
[63] Ibid, 263.
[64] Ibid, 257.

people, and the government's failure to stop them.[65] The following year, Evans in turn reached out to Harding as well. On October 16, 1920, Evans wrote a letter to Harding thanking him for bringing the Haiti issue to the U.S. public's attention, and a few weeks later he wrote to Harding again congratulating his electoral victory.[66] At long last, Evans had a sympathetic ear in Washington.

By this point, the news media had begun to report on injustices committed in occupied Haiti, and stories were being printed about a U.S. missionary having been abused and imprisoned for speaking out. On October 24, 1920, a special dispatch to the *New York Herald* began with the headline "Missionary on Island Protest to Wilson and Lansing in 1918 – Promises – No Action" and was followed with "American Marines and Officials Treat Natives Like Dogs – Preacher Put in Jail – His Appeal to Authorities to End Cruelty Meets with Drastic Reprisal".[67] The increased media attention ratcheted up Republican attention to the issue. Just two days later, Senator Medill McCormick of Illinois wrote to the *New York Herald* concerning the article and expressed his view that the inquiry by the Department of the Navy would be insufficient and that a committee of Congress was required to review the evidence and charges.[68] Evans had gone from missionary to Haiti to becoming a martyr for the Haitian cause. Any doubt that Evans's influence played a significant role in the Republican investigation into Haiti is undermined by the October 25 dispatch of the *New York Herald*, which reported that the

[65] United States Congress, 251-253.
[66] Ibid, 256-257.
[67] Ibid, 258.
[68] Ibid, 264.

Republican National Committee had employed a lawyer to assist Rev. Evans and "prevent any other suppression of the facts by Secretary Daniels or any other board which the present administration may create in its efforts to meet the charges of Senator Harding".[69]

Finally, the work of both L. Ton Evans and S.E. Churchstone Lord were aligning to bring public attention to how the occupation of Haiti had been handled. Lord had provided the NAACP with reports of conditions in Haiti, which in turn fueled that organization's efforts to coordinate with organizations dedicated to restoring Haitian independence, such as the Haiti-Santo Domingo Independence Society, in putting pressure on the government. Evans had likewise spent years petitioning the government directly to take some form of action in reforming, or ending, the occupation. By 1921, a new government administration skeptical of Wilson's prior Haitian policy and pressure from African-American and Haitian independence groups resulted in a full official inquiry into the causes and conduct of the occupation. Though only one of them was present at these hearings, the hearings themselves came about due, at least in part, to the efforts of these two missionaries.

The committee itself had been in Haiti between November 20, 1920 and December 21, 1921 collecting evidence that supported the claims of the organizations and missionaries that were now calling for Haitian independence.[70] At the conclusion of

[69] United States Congress, 263.
[70] Emily Greene Balch, *Occupied Haiti; Being the Report of a Committee of Six Disinterested Americans Representing Organizations Exclusively American, Who, Having Personally Studied Conditions in Haiti in 1926, Favor the Restoration of the Independence of the Negro Republic* (New York: The Writers Publishing Company, Inc., 1927), 123.

these hearings, while the mismanagement of the occupation and the reported abuses of the Haitian population were brought to light, it would not bring an end to the occupation at that time. While the Senate committee acknowledged that mistakes had been made and changes were necessary, simply ending the occupation then and there did not appear feasible. Now assigned the role of high commissioner of the Haiti occupation, Maj. General John Russell told the committee that if his forces were to completely withdraw now, Haiti would "revert to a condition of chaos when, after a time, the United States would be forced to again occupy Haiti or to permit some foreign nation to do so".[71] Despite the order that the Marine presence had brought to occupied Haiti, they were continually dealing with Caco insurgencies and increasing instances of banditry. Cacos had traditionally been fighting groups used by Haitian leaders against their rivals, and vice versa, but during the American occupation the groups that formed became a part of a guerilla resistance movement.

Though the Marines had managed to put down two Caco uprisings by the time of the Senate hearings, guerilla resistance to the occupation and bandits disrupting infrastructure and security in the countryside remained a persistent problem. In March of 1919, a rush message had been sent from the Marine brigade stationed in Port-au-Prince to the Marine Corps requesting an increase of Marine forces there by at least one battalion due to increased "banditry" that the current level of gendarmes could not put down.[72] This was during the last major Caco uprising but reports of banditry continued

[71] Dubois, *Haiti*, 277.
[72] U.S. Department of State, *Brigade, USMC Port au Prince, Haiti, Letter to Commandant, Marine Corps, March 17, 1919*, by Brigade, USMC Port au Prince, Haiti, 838.00/1565, Washington, D.C.: 1919, 1.

well into the 1930s. What Russell suggested instead of a complete withdrawal was to begin working more with the small Haitian elite, which was still largely comprised of the "mulatto" population, who would in turn exert control over the larger Haitian population.[73] Instead of an immediate withdrawal, the U.S. would slowly transfer authority to a specific group of Haitians.

Nevertheless, attention was brought to the Haiti issue in 1921 by missionaries to receptive organizations and politicians alike that could no longer be ignored. In 1926, another report surfaced and was delivered to the U.S. government, this time from a committee established by noted pacifist, scholar, and founder of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Emily Greene Balch. In her report, she and the committee of "six disinterested Americans" compiled a review of previous government action in Haiti and evidence of efforts to reform the occupation since the 1921 hearings and concluded that the restoration of Haitian independence must be prioritized. While the Balch report described the initial investigation by the Department of the Navy of charges of abuse in Haiti as "a reasonably good coat of whitewash, as everybody expected", the Senate Select Committee's investigation had resulted in "marked improvement in the treatment of Haitians, and in the character of the financial administration".[74] When addressing the charges of abuse in Haiti that the Senate investigated, it is important to acknowledge that this report acknowledged the impetus of those investigations as being "an energetic Welsh-American missionary in Haiti (who)

[73] Dubois, *Haiti*, 278.
[74] Balch, 122-123.

made determined efforts to get official attention, efforts which led to unpleasant consequences for himself in Haiti".[75]

While infrastructure projects had moved forward in Haiti, the methods to accomplish this, the Balch report concluded, were a significant part of the problem. Echoing the concerns that Evans and Lord had expressed years earlier, the report viewed the corvée as a major misstep in both pursing infrastructure and security as well as Haitian perception of the occupation:

> What happened was in brief that in order to get military roads built cheaply and quickly, the military authorities, in 1917, revived the legal but obsolete Haitian practice of forced labor for road-work. At first when the construction was near home there little or no trouble, but when work came to be at a distance, unwilling workers were impressed, often very unfairly. They were sometimes manacled like slaves, compelled to work for weeks with little or no pay and inadequate food and shot down if they attempted to escape.[76]

In terms of the abuses of the Haitian population beyond the ill-conceived use of the corvée, the Balch report also echoed the conclusions expressed by both Evans and the Marine Corps that the majority of these instances occurred at the hands of a few local commanders and the gendarmes under their command. It was determined that subordinates, and native Haitian gendarmes "entrusted with unaccustomed power", were largely to blame for these abuses, but nevertheless the damage to the U.S. image in Haiti was done.[77] Despite the dismantling of the corvée by the Marines once its consequences had been realized, and the Senate hearings that had forced stronger oversight of the

[75] Balch, 122.
[76] Ibid, 125.
[77] Ibid, 126.

occupation, the perception of the U.S. presence in Haiti had become overwhelmingly negative to the native population. Simply slowly handing off the management of the occupation to the Haitian mulatto elite, as Russell had convinced the committee to endorse, came too late to save the U.S. image and only served to play on traditional frictions between the mulatto elite and the black majority of the population.

The Balch Committee concluded that it was neither in the interests of the Haitian people or the United States to maintain its occupation of the republic. The majority of Haitians no longer believed that the United States had their interests at heart in its administration of their country, and the United States "from a selfish point of view" had gained nothing from U.S. investments in Haiti other than profit losses, and that there was no longer any justification for the continued expenditure of the occupation.[78] Furthermore, the mismanagement and continuation of the occupation had tarnished the reputation of the United States as a benefactor in the Western Hemisphere:

> The authors of this report believe that the Occupation should be ended for the sake of Haiti, for the sake of the United States, and especially for the sake of good relations among all American republics, and finally because it is in itself an unjustified use of power.[79]

Furthermore, the Balch report concluded that the initial goal of the intervention and occupation, that Haiti through U.S. guidance could be stabilized and able to withstand internal and external stressors, had not and would not be achieved. The Balch Committee did not report sufficient evidence to suggest that the Haitians had learned the necessary

[78] Balch, 150.
[79] Ibid, 151.

financial and administrative mechanisms to be able to manage themselves, but rather had only learned how to operate subordinate to the U.S.[80] Worse still, Haiti remained as undemocratic as ever as, by the time of the Balch report, they were still unable to elect representatives or convene a National Assembly.[81]

The only aspect of the occupation that missionaries like Evans and Lord could appreciate were the reforms to the Haitian education system. Baptist and AME missionaries had long petitioned both the U.S. government and their own organizations for increased support of opening and maintaining schools in Haiti. Col. Russell too advocated and endorsed a new educational bureaucracy called Le Service Technique de l'Agriculture et de l'Enseignement Professionnel, whose purpose was to provide Haitians with technical and agricultural training "to teach each individual a trade, to make each citizen an asset to his country".[82] This unfortunately was also mismanaged and failed to take Haitian perspectives into consideration in its application. The emphasis on vocational training over classical training resulted in condemnation from Haitians and African-Americans alike. To African-Americans like W.E.B Du Bois, the emphasis on vocational training over classical training, which Col. Russell described as "useless" and "detrimental", was perceived as a deliberate attempt to teach Haitians how to be better subservient workers instead of exposing them to literature and philosophy, while Haitian

[80] Balch, 153.
[81] Ibid.
[82] Dubois, *Haiti*, 280.

politicians and intellectuals were concerned that the insistence of English being the main language of instruction was an attempt at U.S. cultural dominance.[83]

The new school system served as the final nail in the coffin of the U.S. occupation of Haiti, and direct attempts by the U.S. government to stabilize the republic. The final controversary centered around a Dr. George Freeman who was selected to run the main school of the vaunted Service Technique. In October 1929, several Haitian students appealed to Dr. Freeman after their scholarships had been withdrawn as part of an effort to shift funding from incentive scholarships for city students to increases in scholarships for field work.[84] The meeting only served to exacerbate the building tensions between the Haitian people and the U.S. occupation, as the students appealed to a man who, while the head of the newly designed Haitian education system project for seven years, had failed to learn either French or Haitian Creole.[85] The result was a domino effect that erupted into anti-occupation protests. After the first wave of students walked out in protest, a sympathy strike soon followed by students from the medical and law colleges, which in turn sparked protest strikes throughout Haiti in both public and private schools.[86] This proved to be the final straw for a U.S. government who had become weary of maintaining an occupation that had already proven to be a liability to U.S. soldiers, finance, and prestige. The Forbes Commission in 1930, under now-President Herbert Hoover, was sent to evaluate the situation in Haiti once more and was not pleased with what it found.

[83] Dubois, *Haiti*, 282.
[84] Schmidt, 196.
[85] Dubois, *Haiti*, 283.
[86] Schmidt, 196.

With French Catholic schools, Haitian politicians and businessmen, and even members of the Garde d'Haiti aligning themselves with the strikers, the commission determined that the occupation was a lost cause.[87] A new treaty determined that the United States would completely withdraw from Haiti by 1936, which was achieved earlier than expected by 1934.

While the occupation continued for several years after their initial protests, L. Ton Evans and S.E. Churchstone Lord can be credited for bringing official and public attention to the conditions and abuses of the early years of the U.S. occupation of Haiti. Lord played a vital role in making the post-Wilson U.S. government pay closer attention to the issue of Haiti by making the NAACP aware of abuses and missteps that had caused the Haitian population to suffer. With the NAACP partnering with pro-Haitian independence organizations, additional pressure was put on the government to investigate these alleged abuses. Evans also played a pivotal role by petitioning two government administrations to take a closer look at the conduct of the occupation. While one administration ignored his appeals at the highest levels, and occupational forces at the local level attempted to silence him, his persistence resulted in the succeeding administration taking a vested interest in reforming the occupation. Both of these missionaries fulfilled a preexisting legacy of Baptist and AME missionaries whom had worked to bring U.S. attention to the plight of the Haitian people and to work as intermediaries between Washington and Port-au-Prince. What set them apart is that, while their forerunners had played the role of bridges between those two worlds, the

[87] Schmidt, 197.

circumstances of the U.S. occupation forced these U.S. missionaries to serve as a foil against Haitian revolutions at first and U.S. imperialism later on.

In these last two chapters, the role of U.S. missionaries in the execution of the U.S. intervention and subsequent military occupation have been demonstrated as significant, contrary to the limited historiographical image as that of agents of U.S. capitalism, and resulting from a dynamic precedent of U.S. missionary involvement in U.S.-Haitian affairs since the early nineteenth century. Chapter five will further demonstrate the impact these missionaries had on the U.S. public opinion over the occupation, though it is prudent to first address the question of why a role this significant in understanding the U.S. invasion and occupation of Haiti has gone so long overlooked. That U.S. missionaries were so involved in these events, yet have only recently been mentioned in passing in works such as Renda's *Taking Haiti* adds credence to the argument put forth by Michel-Rolph Trouillot about Haiti's history being "unthinkable". Though Trouillot focused on the Haitian Revolution, and also did not mention U.S. missionaries as being significant to Haitian history, perhaps his assertion of historians in the U.S. and Europe being unable to conceive of Haitian resistance to white dominance until the World War II era could explain this omission.

First, if the belief that people of African descent were naturally docile and subordinate persisted among policymakers and historians alike during the 1915-1934 occupation, it would explain the short-sighted use of the corvée. As the usage of forced labor of Haitians to streamline U.S. infrastructure projects in Haiti was largely the catalyst for the abuses that ultimately turned the majority of Haitians and U.S.

missionaries against the occupation, one cannot help but wonder how the administration ever thought such a system would be effective for a people whose national identity was formed over resisting labor forced by foreign whites. Perhaps the fact that it was a Haitian law (albeit an outdated one) combined with this lingering perception that Haitians would naturally follow along with it is what made the U.S. military decide on what in hindsight seems such a questionable course of action. This is further supported as the historiography of the U.S. occupation demonstrates how the U.S. dismissed Haitian resistance at the time as insignificant. The high points of Haitian resistance to the U.S. occupation occurred within the first six months with Caco insurgents mostly disrupting food supplies to U.S.-occupied coastal cities, raiding Marine encampments, and disrupting railroad communications, but were largely suppressed until the corvée triggered a second Caco rebellion in 1918-1919.[88] In spite of this resistance, Yveline Alexis in *Remembering Charlemagne Peralte and His Defense of Haiti's Revolution* points out that, in U.S. military correspondence throughout the occupation, the Cacos are consistently reported merely as apolitical and disorganized "bandits" rather than as enemy combatants.[89] This validates Trouillot's assertion that Haitian resistance, even by the early twentieth century, against white dominance was still viewed as "unthinkable".

Taking what has been demonstrated in terms of the role of U.S. missionaries in the occupation, and how they too have been omitted from these events, could their role in

[88] Schmidt, 83.
[89] Yveline Alexis, "Remembering Charlemagne Peralte and His Defense of Haiti's Revolution," in *The Idea of Haiti: Rethinking Crisis and Development*, ed. Millery Polyne (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013), 53.

these events at the time also have been deemed "unthinkable"? The history of *The Caribbean Policy of the United States, 1890-1920* written in 1942 described the U.S. intervention and occupation of Haiti with references to Haitian resentment due to the corvée and abuses by the Marines and Gendarmes.[90] The author concluded that the mistakes and failures of the occupation resulted from poor oversight due to distraction by the First World War, and poor training of the Haitians to take over after the U.S withdrawal.[91] At no point are missionaries mentioned as having played a role in these events. More recent work, such as Lars Schoultz's *Beneath the United States*, described the circumstances by which the abuses of the Haitians were brought to light as having solely occurred through the Naval investigation with no mention of U.S. missionaries.[92]

Having demonstrated in the last two chapters the impact of missionaries such as Evans and Lord on these events, it seems surprising that Calcott's history of U.S. Caribbean policy written so soon after these events did not gain any mention. The following chapter will further demonstrate the far-reaching impact of these missionaries on shaping U.S. public opinion against the occupation. Therefore, the reason for their omission from these events can be speculated with Trouillot's assertion in mind. If Haitian resistance to white dominance was still unthinkable by the time of the U.S. occupation, it stands to reason that the idea of U.S. missionaries antagonizing their own government's administration over the Haitians was equally unthinkable. Mary Renda's *Taking Haiti* makes the case for the strong role of paternalist discourse that Wilson used

[90] Calcott, 419-420, 477-479.
[91] Ibid., 478, 483.
[92] Schoultz, 255-256.

to justify the occupation. As the next chapter will continue to demonstrate, U.S. missionaries in Haiti challenged that discourse throughout the occupation.

Were These Missionaries to Haiti Unique?

The history of U.S. missionary activity in Haiti prior to the U.S. intervention in 1915 was intermittent and unstable. Particularly U.S. Baptists had tried multiple times to establish a permanent missionary presence there, but cultural backlash and chronic political upheaval consistently deterred these efforts. In spite of these challenges, when U.S. Baptist, Episcopal, and Methodist missionaries were able to operate within Haiti, they often served as intermediaries between the U.S. and Haitian governments and appealed to these governments on occasion on behalf of the Haitians they served. The 1915 intervention altered that previous relationship for missionaries to Haiti from the Baptists and the African Methodist Episcopalians. As the U.S. maintained an increasingly unpopular occupation there, these missionaries, while still appealing to the U.S. government on the behalf of Haitians, were now doing so in contrast to United States policy. With at least one offer of serving as intermediary being rejected, mismanagement of the occupation turned these missionaries from potential intermediaries to antagonists against the U.S. presence there.

As remarkable as this shift in the role of U.S. missionaries in Haiti was, it is important to recognize that Haiti was not the only nation in the Latin American/Caribbean region to be militarily occupied at this time. The 1915 intervention in Haiti was but one conflict within a period of escalating U.S. intervention during the early twentieth century that came to be known as The Banana Wars. While intervention

during this period did not always result in U.S. military occupation, the occupation of Haiti was preceded by the 1912 occupation of Nicaragua and followed by the 1916 occupation of the Dominican Republic. As all three of these occupations began and ended roughly around the same time, the role of U.S. missionaries across these three occupied territories raises questions. Were U.S. Baptist and AME missionaries in Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic also representing public resentment of those occupations to the U.S. government, or was what happened in Haiti an anomaly among the U.S.-occupied territories of Latin America and the Caribbean? Was this development of U.S. missionaries as politically active, self-appointed advocates of the population under U.S. occupation consistent across these three nations, or was Haiti the only place this occurred?

Having demonstrated that U.S. missionaries in Haiti had a significant role in shaping and challenging the U.S. occupation of Haiti in spite of their traditional omission from the historiography of these events, this project will now address the larger question of whether this role was unique or consistent across the Latin American/Caribbean nations occupied by the United States at that time. In making comparisons with the parallel U.S. occupations of the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua, one consistency is the omission from the historiography of U.S. policy in early twentieth century Latin America of any significance on the part of U.S. missionaries during those events. While the history of U.S. policy towards Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic are presented case studies in *Exporting Democracy*, the role of missionaries in these events are not discussed in either case study, nor in any of the other Latin American case studies that the

book presents.[93] Furthermore, in Thomas O'Brien's *The Revolutionary Mission*, the U.S. intervention in Nicaragua is covered in detail, but excludes any mention of U.S. missionaries and the religious reactionary elements (specifically among the Caballeros Catolicos).[94] However, their significance is better described in works whose sole focus is on the history of those two occupations than in either general histories of U.S. intervention in twentieth century Latin America or in works specific to the occupation of Haiti.

One aspect that Haiti shared with both Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic was that none of them, nor any other nations in the Caribbean and Latin America, had been a priority to Protestant missionary organizations prior to the early twentieth century. While Baptists, Methodists, and Episcopalians throughout the nineteenth century had attempted to establish a permanent mission presence in Haiti with their organizations' support and blessing, these attempts were spearheaded by individuals from those denominations who volunteered out of a specific desire to serve there, and not as part of a large-scale objective of their affiliated organizations. Those who went to Haiti did so either out of personal conviction, to aid in racial uplift by supporting the first "Black Republic", or both, but often found it difficult to get necessary resources from their organization's mission boards. The surge in overseas missions among U.S. Protestant mission organizations that began in the late nineteenth century was focused

[93] Abraham F. Lowenthal, *Exporting Democracy: The United States and Latin America: Case Studies* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991).
[94] Thomas O'Brien, *The Revolutionary Mission: American Enterprise in Latin America, 1900-1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

predominantly on Asia, with only those with a vested interest in Haiti's future opting to go there and pressing for support to do so. The rest of Latin America and the Caribbean, which did not have Haiti's symbolic position as the forerunner in the history of black liberation, was also of comparatively limited interest to African-American religious organizations at the turn of the century.

By 1910, however, an American by the name of Samuel Guy Inman began to change that when, like L. Ton Evans whom had tried to bring greater attention specifically for Haiti, pressed for greater Protestant engagement in Latin America as a whole. Born in Trinity, Texas, Inman began his ministry with the Disciples of Christ in Hell's Kitchen, NY, which influenced him to emphasize the social gospel that focused not only on the spiritual needs of the individual, but also took into account the individual's social context.[95] The lessons learned in Hell's Kitchen were later reinforced after Inman began missionary work abroad. After spending ten years in Rio Piedras, Mexico during revolutionary conditions, Inman became passionate about increasing U.S. missionary involvement in Latin America.[96] What he would work against was the prevailing mentality across Protestant organizations was that Asia, which lacked a substantial Christian population of any denomination, was a much higher priority than Latin America, which was perceived as firmly within the grip of Roman Catholicism.

Protestant mission organizations in Europe were convinced that Catholicism was far too entrenched in Latin America for other forms of Christianity to take root. After

[95] Sydney H. Rooy, "Inman, Samuel Guy," *Biographical Dictionary of Christian Missions*, ed. Gerald H. Anderson (New York: Macmillan Reference USA, 1998), 319.
[96]Ibid.

Protestant and Anglican representatives at the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910 made the decision not to consider missionary activity in Catholic lands, the North American mission societies pressed by Inman formed the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America (CCLA).[97] Inman would serve as a chairman of the CCLA between 1913 and 1938, and would work both as an advocate for Protestant missionary work in Latin America as well as a shaper of U.S. policy in the region.[98] One of his first initiatives was the Panama Conference of 1916, in which Protestant missions were not only planned for Latin America, but also coordinated so that the various denominations would not overlap in their efforts. The conference determined that the initial widespread mission efforts of the denominations would divide Latin American territories with the Disciples of Christ extending their work in Argentina, the Baptist Home Mission Society in Nicaragua, the Methodists were to begin operations in Costa Rica, and Northern Presbyterians and Methodists were to undertake operations in areas yet to be determined.[99] Though Haiti was not mentioned in this initial division of interdenominational foci, Evans and other U.S. missionaries in Haiti's history would have shared Inman's emphasis on the need for the elevation of moral character, especially through education, interdenominational cooperation, and that Jesus Christ was the savior of both individuals and societies as a whole.[100]

---

[97] Rooy, 319.
[98] Ibid.
[99] Harlan P. Beach, *Renaissant Latin America: An Outline and Interpretation of the Congress on Christian Work in Latin America, Held at Panama, February 10-19, 1916* (New York: Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1916), 232.
[100] Rooy, 319.

One other thing that Inman and Evans had in common was a sympathetic ear in Theodore Roosevelt. Opposed to military intervention in Latin American lands himself, Inman was able to influence Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy.[101] Evans by contrast had been supportive of at least some form of U.S. military intervention initially. As the United States militarily occupied three nations within the Latin American region, Inman would later take it upon himself to survey conditions in Haiti and the Dominican Republic as these parallel occupations progressed. This survey would highlight comparative and contrasting elements of both occupations. His work in establishing a greater Baptist presence in U.S.-occupied Nicaragua on the other hand would prove to be the unwitting provocation of cultural and international tensions that would ultimately put Baptist missionaries at risk.

U.S. Missionaries in Nicaragua

The circumstances of the U.S. occupation of Nicaragua were significantly different from those of Haiti. One major difference is that the U.S. intervention in Nicaragua in 1912 was not the result of a perceived German threat or the U.S.'s weariness of the government's chronic political instability. The installment of U.S. troops in both 1912, and again in 1927, in Nicaragua was not the result of the collapse and overthrow of the Nicaraguan government, but rather by its invitation. In 1910, the U.S.-supported Adolfo Diaz was put into power as provisional president, forcing liberal President Jose Santos Zelaya from office.[102] Zelaya in turn incited unrest among the

[101] Rooy, 319.
[102] Stanford University, "Timeline: Nicaragua," Stanford.edu. https://web.stanford.edu/group/arts/nicaragua/discovery_eng/timeline/ (accessed January 21, 2019).

Nicaraguan population whom were becoming more and more resentful of the imposed Diaz government. As civil unrest intensified, Diaz requested U.S. military support in 1912, which deployed troops in Nicaragua to quell resistance to the Diaz government.[103] Two years later, the U.S. and Nicaraguan governments would further solidify their cooperation with the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty, which in exchange for $3 million would allow the U.S. to acquire rights to build a canal through Nicaraguan territory, lease the Great and Little Corn Islands, and establish a naval base in the Gulf of Fonseca.[104] Resistance to the U.S. presence in Nicaragua would ebb and flow until, as in Haiti, the U.S. would withdraw its troops in 1934.

While the arrival of a military occupational force in Nicaragua did not occur until 1912, and again in 1927, a U.S. corporate and missionary presence had been established earlier in the previous century. During the late nineteenth century U.S. business interests, particularly in the increasingly popular banana industry, resulted in an American colony in the Mosquito Coast called Bluefields. After gaining autonomous status during the previous British control of Nicaragua, the indigenous Miskitu government, fueled by anti-Nicaraguan sentiment, worked with the U.S. fruit companies to establish operations there in 1880.[105] However, when U.S. businesses started to arrive at their new colony, they found that there were already Americans that had been working there in a very different capacity for decades. Moravians, whom had first arrived in the Miskitu region in

[103] Stanford University, "Timeline: Nicaragua."
[104] Ibid.
[105] Craig L. Dozier, *Nicaragua's Mosquito Shore: The Years of British and American Presence* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1985), 142.

the late 1840s, had spent the last few decades providing educational and moral uplift as well as construction for better housing and had established themselves in the community of 800-900 inhabitants by the time the Mosquito Fruit Company came into being.[106] Upon the arrival of U.S. companies to Bluefields, in spite of their shared national origin, the relationship between the corporate and missionary communities was in some ways strained in the beginning. From the Moravian perspective, the natives were becoming less attentive to evangelical matters over time, which the Moravians blamed on influences from the incoming secular populations of the British first and later the Americans.[107] However, from the corporate point of view, the school system set in place by the Moravians there became popular for the families of the arriving Americans, their appreciation for which helped improve the relationship between the two groups.[108]

While most Nicaraguans responded negatively to the expansion and encroachment of the United States into their territory, the indigenous Miskitu remained supportive of the U.S. presence, and particularly of the U.S. missionary presence. Referring to other Nicaraguans as "Spaniards", Miskitu accounts of life before the Moravians' arrival describe a period of unquestioning subservience to the majority population: "The white parsons worked in the Moravian church. They taught us about our rights. If they had not, how would we know about them today? Miskitu rights was part of Christian education".[109] The Moravian missionaries of the nineteenth century played a

[106] Dozier, 143.
[107] Ibid.
[108] Ibid.
[109] Charles R. Hale, *Resistance and Contradiction: Miskitu Indians and the Nicaraguan State, 1894-1987* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 71.

significant role through their education initiatives in laying the infrastructure, though not their original intent, for the later U.S. business presence in Bluefields as well as fostering a sense of national identity among the Miskitu people. While this helped endear the Miskitu to the growing U.S. presence, it only contributed to wider resentment of U.S. missionaries among the larger Nicaraguan population.

By the time the U.S. occupation began in 1912, the resentment against growing U.S. influence in the country and region was prevalent across Nicaraguan society, and in many ways even among those most supportive of the U.S. troop presence. While the conservative Nicaraguan political leaders and elites were favorable to the U.S. military support that kept them in power against their liberal rivals, they were much less favorable to the U.S. Protestant missionaries that followed. While the nineteenth century had seen predominantly Moravian activity in the Miskitu region of Nicaragua, the arrival of U.S. troops, the CCLA decision to expand Baptist operations there, and eased travel risks after the end of the First World War resulted in a surge of Baptist missionaries in Nicaragua.[110] The arrival of these Baptist missionaries created a further divide within Nicaraguan society as their presence stoked the already building pro-Catholic sense of national identity among important members of the elite. While many among the Nicaraguan elite viewed the Protestant missionaries as agents of modernity bringing much needed reforms as an extension of the military presence they had requested, a smaller but more powerful

[110] Michel Gobat, *Confronting the American Dream: Nicaragua Under U.S. Imperial Rule* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005), 177.

group of conservative elites viewed the Baptists as a threat to Nicaraguan national identity, which they associated heavily with Catholic traditions.[111]

Several factors coincided at this time to create an organized conservative backlash against U.S. Protestants. The expansion of U.S. Baptists into Nicaragua occurred in parallel to other events such as the formation of groups such as the Partido Obrero (Nicaragua's first socialist party), the Federacion Obrera Nicaraguense (a national labor federation), and formation of the country's first women's organization.[112] To the conservative oligarchs, U.S. modernity was eroding traditional Nicaraguan society, and the Protestant missionaries with their modern education initiatives were the agents of this change. Influenced furthermore by the arrival of Jesuits in Granada after having been expelled from Mexico in 1917, these oligarchs formed a new, all-male organization known as the Liga de Cabelleros Catolicos (The League of Catholic Knights) in 1918.[113] This group dedicated itself to resisting the Americanization of Nicaragua by resisting the forces of modernity, mainly Protestantism, labor mobilization, and feminism, that threatened traditional Nicaraguan identity. The U.S. troops were a necessary evil in their minds, but U.S. ideas needed to be resisted and even purged from Nicaraguan society.

Initially the Cabelleros Catolicos movement began by trying to compete with Baptist operations over public influence. Along with disseminating their traditional views through newspapers like *El Catolico*, the Cabelleros Catolicos also helped priests establish recreation centers, libraries, and schools in order to utilize education as their

[111] Gobat.
[112] Ibid.
[113] Ibid.

rivals had.[114] Some of their programs catered to the groups within Nicaraguan society that they were particularly afraid of being corrupted by modernity. The Accion Social Catolica de Damas y Senoritas and the Hijas de Maria were established to prevent elite women from what they considered to be the vices of modernity, and Circulo Catolico de Obreros as a workers circle to aid the poor while also convincing them of the corruption of capitalism.[115] This initial approach was for the values of the Cabelleros Catolicos to become reinforced in Nicaraguan society as to not allow Protestantism to gain any further foothold.

It is important to acknowledge what set the Baptist surge of the post-war era apart from the Moravians who had been present in Nicaragua since the 1840s. While there was undoubtedly resentment by the conservative elites to U.S. Moravians teaching a greater sense of national identity among a minority ethnic group within Nicaraguan borders, the resistance to U.S. Protestantism that triggered the formation of the Cabelleros Catolicos did not reach that level prior to the arrival of the Baptists. The main difference was that the Moravians had settled and administered to a population on the fringes of Nicaraguan society, whereas the Baptists arrived alongside a military presence and operated within the capital of Managua. The all-male American Baptist Home Mission Society and the Women's American Baptist Home Mission Society first established their presence in Managua with ministers, physicians, nurses, and schoolteachers, and then quickly proceeded to expand into other urban centers and the countryside.[116] This group of

[114] Gobat, 178.
[115] Ibid.
[116] Ibid, 180.

Protestants could not be dismissed by conservatives as merely a small community catering to the outlying Miskitu population. This was a group that was planted in the heart of the country and had spread its vines outward.

While the Cabelleros Catolicos began their movement through print and social and educational outreach, they soon grew more militant. Convinced that the Baptist missionaries were part of an effort to de-Catholicize the common folk in order to weaken and conquer Latin Americans from below, the movement escalated to include organized demonstrations against, and sometimes barring entry into, Protestant churches, schools, and health clinics.[117] As the movement grew more violent, anti-Protestant actions began in the countryside but in 1925 would finally erupt in a violent confrontation in the city of Granada.[118] The incident centered around a group of Baptist missionaries focused on establishing a school there. The Dallas-based group arrived in Granada in 1922 and established a meeting place and day-school on the outskirts of the city, which had provoked local, proclerical harassment but nothing as serious as when they decided in June 1925 to relocate their headquarters to a part of the city's center that was traditionally reserved for the local elite.[119] The proclerical outcry was immediate and widespread. The city's bishop, as well as fifty Cabelleros Catolicos and upper-class women wrote a letter to the mayor protesting the Baptist presence there.[120]

[117] Gobat, 181-182.
[118] Ibid.
[119] Ibid.
[120] Ibid, 182-183.

The Baptists, accustomed to threats by the Cabelleros Catolicos, were not swayed to abandon their new headquarters by this protest. As a result, the Cabelleros Catolicos and their allies among the female upper class began organizing outside the Baptist services and attempting to disrupt their services either through crowding entrances, singing hymns, and allegedly throwing sticks and "filth" at the congregation.[121] Then one final threat came. On July 19, a Jesuit priest went to the doors of the Baptist chapel and publicly announced that, if they did not leave the city immediately, "blood would surely flow in the streets".[122] The ultimatum had been given, and the next morning initiated a series of events that forced the Baptist presence out of Granada. At four in the morning, a bomb exploded at the door of the mission, and though the explosion only damaged the building with no loss of life, mass demonstrations against the Baptists followed and forced the Nicaraguan government to dispatch troops to restore order.[123] In the end, even government troops could not put an end to the unrest in Granada. As the Cabelleros Catolicos regrouped and resumed their terror campaign, by September of 1925, the Central American Mission finally pulled its Baptist missionaries out of Granada entirely.[124] This incident, though specifically directed at U.S. missionaries, occurred alongside several anti-government protests. That same year, U.S. forces had withdrawn from Nicaragua only to be redeployed there as their departure triggered rebellions throughout the country.[125]

---

[121] Gobat, 182-183.
[122] Ibid.
[123] Ibid.
[124] Ibid.
[125] "Timeline: Nicaragua."

U.S. Missionaries in the Dominican Republic

The circumstances that lead to the U.S. occupation of the Dominican Republic in 1916 on the other hand shared greater similarity to those that had preempted the occupation of Haiti the previous year. Though the perceived threat of German infiltration that was attributed to Haiti was absent in the Dominican Republic, the years since 1911 had represented a period of heightened political instability there just as they had in Haiti. Also as the case had been with Haiti, this political instability had existed earlier but did not reach its crescendo until 1911. The assassination of Dominican President Ulises Heureaux in 1899 created both revolutionary and consequent financial turmoil that forced the United States to intervene to prevent European creditors from forcibly taking their debts.[126] The Dominican Republic's debts as well as those of Haiti both contributed to the development of the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, but this effectively ended any potential threat of European, or specifically German, involvement. The application for the Roosevelt Corollary in the case of the Dominican Republic was for the U.S. to take direct control of their customs houses, which would be fully achieved by 1907 as opposed to Haiti when this was achieved upon occupation.[127]

Another similarity between the U.S. motivations that would lead it to militarily occupy both Haiti and the Dominican Republic was the desire for a strategic port in the region. During the nineteenth century when President Baez was negotiating with U.S. President Grant over American annexation of the Dominican Republic, one of the

[126] Bruce J. Calder, *The Impact of Intervention: The Dominican Republic During the U.S. Occupation of 1916-1924* (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1984), 4.
[127] Ibid.

proverbial carrots Baez dangled was the Bay of Samana as a deep-water harbor and coaling station.[128] As attractive as this may have been, it was not enough for the U.S. to agree to annexation in the nineteenth century, and though it may have been strategically beneficial, control of the Bay of Samana does not appear to have been as strategically vital in the early twentieth century the way Mole St. Nicholas was. More at issue was the insurance of Dominican political and financial restabilization in the wake of the Heureaux assassination in order to prevent disorder in the region and European interference.

After taking control of the Dominican customs houses, the country enjoyed a brief period of stability before the upheavals of 1911-1916. After another Dominican presidential assassination occurred in the November of 1911, which resulted in the United States sending a special commission there accompanied by 750 marines in 1912 for the purposes of establishing a stable government that would be freely elected, but also cooperative with the United States.[129] Using the control it already possessed over Dominican finances, the United States was able to compel the Dominican government to adopt reforms, settle its border disputes with Haiti, and force the resignation of the besieged President Eladio Victoria and replace him with Adolfo Nouel.[130] The alternative to adhering to these demands was the threat of military force.

While these demands were met in 1912, the changes did little to stop the growing unrest in the country and the Dominican Republic's political instability would mimic that

[128] Calder, 2.
[129] Ibid, 5.
[130] Ibid.

of its neighbor. By 1916, the U.S. had already militarily occupied the Republic of Haiti, while in the Dominican Republic an attempt to overthrow the government would allow history to repeat itself on the other side of Hispaniola. In an attempt to seize power from President Jimenez that May, General Desiderio Arias with the support of allies in the Dominican government staged a coup.[131] The U.S. government once again lost its patience with an unstable Caribbean government and threatened to militarily intervene. President Jimenez, while being pressured to accept U.S. military support, only requested weapons from the United States to maintain his authority with.[132] The U.S. government, however, decided to follow the policy it had already applied to the Haitian situation and sent troops to militarily occupy the Dominican Republic. The outcome of U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic shared the same path as that in Haiti where U.S. forces once again had to establish an occupation without a clear goal of how to effectively manage it or how long it intended to remain in effect.

The occupation in the Dominican Republic not only shared root causes which ultimately lead to U.S. intervention, but also in who was advocating on the Dominicans' behalf. While the presence of Baptist missionaries in the Dominican Republic was negligible, especially compared to U.S. Baptist efforts in Nicaragua, and had not produced an outspoken advocate such as L. Ton Evans in Haiti, the A.M.E. and Episcopal Churches were highly active there in both missionary work and later in advocating Dominican independence from the occupation. The African Methodist

[131] Calder, 8.
[132] Ibid.

Episcopal Church was able to first take root in the Dominican Republic as early as 1830 under the same invitation that Haitian President Boyer had extended to U.S. missionaries to Haiti at that time.[133] Haiti had invaded and conquered the Dominican Republic in 1822 fearing it might be used in the future by the Europeans to regain a foothold on Hispaniola, from which the Dominicans would not regain their independence until 1844. One cannot help but acknowledge the irony that Haiti itself would be invaded by the United States for the same reason almost one hundred years later. As an unexpected result of the Haitian occupation of the Dominican Republic, the U.S. missionaries that came to Haiti at this time also filtered into Dominican territory and remained there after Dominican independence.

By 1919, the AME was reported by the CCLA to have a thriving presence in the Bay of Samana area and a notable presence in the capital of Santo Domingo. Though many of their missionaries had suffered and even been killed during the Haitian political unrest during and after the Boyer presidency, the AME was able to establish a colony at Samana where they would able to continue operating by the time of the 1919 CCLA report. Samuel Inman, while in occupied Haiti and the Dominican Republic, reported that the AME had at Samana a church building, 325 members (most of them English-speaking), a school in the church with 35 pupils, and a second school nine miles outside of Samana with 85 students and two Sunday schools.[134] The AME missionaries also had a small presence in Santo Domingo with a building originally given to them by President

[133] Samuel Guy Inman, *Through Santo Domingo and Haiti: A Cruise With the Marines* (New York: Committee on Co-operation in Latin America, 1919), 49.
[134] Ibid.

Boyer to use as a church, while the remaining extent of Protestantism in the capital only consisted of another church used by the Moravians and Episcopal services held specifically for Americans in the Customs Collector's building.[135] The fact that all of these churches were English-speaking and lacked any Spanish-speaking services is telling of the limits of their impact outside of their small enclaves.[136] The AME community in Samana during the nineteenth century would have catered predominantly to African-American immigrants to Haiti and its Dominican territory during that period, and later there and in the capital of Santo Domingo the Protestant services were catered towards the Americans present there via the occupation.

While the AME and smaller Protestant missions in the Dominican Republic failed to expand significantly within the Spanish-speaking, Catholic population there, it did manage to impact the debates on the U.S. occupation. Just as the NAACP had received reports about the abuses of the U.S. occupation against the Haitians, reports were also coming in from their AME contacts in the Dominican Republic. In their petition to the Select Committee for the 1922 Senate inquiry into the occupations of Haiti and the Dominican Republic, the NAACP along with Haiti-Santo Domingo Independence Society and the Union Patriotique d'Haiti presented a story very similar to what had been described in Haiti. In specifically addressing the Dominican Republic, this coalition of groups points out that, while there is single comprehensive report or Evans-like memorandum for the Dominican Republic as there had been in Haiti, charges and reports

[135] Inman, 49.
[136] Ibid, 49-50.

of the same infringement on Dominican sovereignty and abuses against the population had still been discovered.[137] The recommendation was that both occupations should be brought to an end, and the offer was made to submit proposals to the committee on how to transition authority from the United States to the two native governments.[138]

While the Senate hearings devoted greater attention to the issue of Haiti than the Dominican Republic, the Dominicans still were able to make a case for their independence. Through their legal representative, Horace Knowles, and a memorandum sent by Dominican President Henriquez presented six specific charges; 1) There was no legal basis for the intervention, 2) the 1916 invasion was in violation of the U.S. Constitution, preexisting U.S.-Dominican treaties, international law, Wilson's Fourteen Points, and the overall spirit of the Monroe Doctrine, 3) "excesses, abuses, cruelties and murders" had been carried out by U.S. marines against the Dominican population, 4) the military government had issued orders that were "unreasonable, cruel, and totally un-American", 5) both private and corporate rights and property had been violated during the occupation, and 6) the military government had pursued policies that were "incompetent, wasteful and extravagant".[139] While very little attention was given by the committee to the Dominican issue in contrast to the Haiti investigation, the U.S. government was already looking towards a path of exit for the occupation there that these concerns only reinforced. While increased rebellions in Haiti prior to the hearings had forced the conclusion that the country was not stable enough to function if the U.S. immediately

[137] United States Congress, 46.
[138] Ibid, 47.
[139] Calder, 215.

withdrew, the limited rebellious activity in spite of growing public anger over the U.S. occupation lead to the conclusion that a transition to a return of native sovereignty in the Dominican Republic was more feasible in the short term. By 1924, the United States would withdraw its forces from the Dominican Republic, while its forces in neighboring Haiti would remain there for another decade.

CHAPTER VI

SPREADING THE (NOT SO) GOOD NEWS: U.S. MISSIONARY RESISTANCE AND THE U.S. PRESS REACTION

Earlier in Chapter III, we explored the issue of America's divided opinion over Haiti and what it represented in the nineteenth century regarding its relationship with the ongoing abolition debate in the United States. As the United States took control of Haiti in the early twentieth century, Haiti once again represented a divisive issue for the U.S. public. Before, during and after the 1921 Senate hearings, which served as the apex of government debate on the merits and offenses of the occupation, the debate was largely carried out in the U.S. press. Though Baptist missionary, L. Ton Evans, and AME missionary, S.E. Churchstone Lord actively petitioned the U.S. government to amend its administration of Haiti in the early years of the occupation, they only succeeded in influencing political policy after 1918. The culmination of political pressure from these missionaries came in 1921 during the U.S. Senate hearings. However, direct petitioning against the U.S. government was not the limit of their influence on the debate. Lord had written in vain to Secretary of State, Robert Lansing, and Evans had written in vain until the Wilson administration was replaced with the more sympathetic Harding administration. Nevertheless, Lord during this time more actively influenced public opinion, particularly African-American public opinion, than he did directly to the U.S.

government. Evans focused his efforts more on influencing the government directly, but news of this also helped shape U.S. public opinion of the occupation. While much of the previous chapter focused on political responses to missionary resistance to the occupation, examining the response of the press reveals the missionaries' role in turning U.S. public opinion against the occupation, further pressuring the U.S. government in its administration of Haiti.

In the article *Then and Now: Haitian Journalism as Resistance to US Occupation and US-Led Reconstruction*, Shearon Roberts described how Haitian journalists were jailed, censored, and forced into exile for writing against U.S. control.[1] The focus of her study did not include the role of U.S. missionaries in this event, so it remains unclear whether they impacted the Haitian press at the time. What this study reveals is how the U.S. press was impacted by U.S missionaries and how it diminished public support for the occupation. In examining U.S. newspaper accounts of the occupation throughout the period of 1915 to 1934, what is revealed is several crucial shifts that can be tied back directly to missionary efforts to spread the word of abuses committed against the Haitian people. In the Introduction of this work, it was mentioned that there were reasons suggested in the historiography, particularly by Trouillot and Schoultz, as to why Haiti has been so often omitted from studies of the history of U.S. policy in the Caribbean and Latin America. One reason Schoultz asserted was that U.S. Progressives and public opinion were largely disinterested and not outspoken over the abuses in Haiti compared

[1] Shearon Roberts, "Then and Now: Haitian Journalism as Resistance to US Occupation and US-Led Reconstruction." *Journal of Haitian Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 2, Special Issue on the US Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934 (Fall 2015), 242.

to Wilson's other interventions in the region.[2] The findings presented in this chapter contradict that assessment showing not only public awareness, but a dramatic shift in the press's characterizations of the occupation over time. First, prior to the 1921 Senate hearings, press opinions over the occupation were largely divided across racial lines. African-American newspapers such as *The Crisis* and *The Chicago Defender* prior to 1921 were far more critical of the occupation then their white counterparts. As missionary reports of abuses began to appear between Evans' 1918 memorandum and the 1921 hearings, condemnation of the occupation in the press became more universal and consistent as it continued into the 1930s. Another interesting development revealed in the press was the shifting relationship of U.S. Episcopal missionaries to Haiti. Though Bishop Holly in the nineteenth century had advocated for Haiti, press reports record Episcopal missionaries, rather than opposing the occupation, refuting the claims of their Baptist and AME counterparts.

Press Reactions, 1915

To prove the impact of U.S. Baptist and AME missionaries on political and public opinion that occurred from 1918 until the end of the occupation, one only need examine the press coverage of the occupation before that point. In the immediate aftermath of the U.S. invasion of Haiti in 1915, national and local newspapers that reported on the invasion and subsequent occupation did so in favorable terms. Just two days after the invasion, *The Christian Science Monitor* on July 30 reported on the successful seizure and disarmament of the capital of Port-au-Prince and conveyed the optimistic viewpoint

[2] Schoultz, 293.

that the U.S. presence there was expected to be temporary. Declaring that the marines would only remain until a de facto government was established, the invasion was first interpreted as a brief and necessary military action to help a neighboring country get back on its own feet.[3] In this early national newspaper report, the closest thing to questioning the official narrative was a minor discrepancy in the statements made by the U.S. State Department and Admiral Caperton while overseeing operations in Haiti. The story reported that, while the State Department made the statement that disarmament of Port-au-Prince was already underway, Admiral Caperton stated that there was still light resistance in the city and that disarmament of Haitian soldiers and civilians would proceed that day.[4] Other than this minor difference between statements, the overall mission was portrayed as a swift success and there was nothing of the accusations of censorship that soon followed.

Local newspapers also described in the days and weeks that followed how the invasion was both beneficial and necessary to U.S. security and Haitian stability. At this early stage, missionary protests from either the Baptists or AME are absent and therefore have not yet begun to shape public or political opinion against the occupation. That is not to say, however, that the U.S. missionaries in Haiti were entirely absent from the news. Rather than being antagonists against the invasion, the local newspaper for Ardmore, OK, *The Daily Ardmoreite*, mentions missionaries as immediate beneficiaries of the presence

[3] "Committee of Safety In Haiti To Disarm City," *The Christian Science Monitor (1908-Current File)*, Jul 30, 1915, 1, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/509389075?accountid=14604.
[4] Ibid.

of American forces. The report on August 2 described an incident in which a mob in Port-au-Prince had attacked a Wesleyan mission for allegedly harboring a murderer, but that the city was now under the control of the Marines.[5] The Navy report of this incident was later included in the 1921 Senate hearings, but details remained vague. While the report states that the mission had "secreted therein" a man whom allegedly murdered a prisoner while in jail, why the missionaries chose to harbor him along with any further details of the circumstances were unfortunately absent from the report.[6] S.E. Churchstone Lord was already expressing his hopeful yet skeptical assessment of the U.S. presence in Haiti to W.E.B. Du Bois, which in turn would make its way into *The Crisis*. The article in *The Daily Ardmoreite*, however, serves as a reminder that, just as missionaries had an impact on the occupation, the occupation in turn impacted them as well.

Further justification for the U.S. presence was also expressed in another newspaper local to Fairmont, WV, *The West Virginian*. On August 11, an article was printed on the reaction of the Haitian minister in the U.S. to the intervention. While acknowledging the protests of Dr. Solon Menos denying the right of the United States to "assume military dictatorship", the article continues by addressing the merit of U.S. intervention.[7]

---

[5] "Uncle Sam's Marines Are Holding City," *The Daily Ardmoreite*, August 2, 1915, *Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers*, Library of Congress, <https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85042303/1915-08-02/ed-1/seq-1/>.
[6] United States Congress, 1674.
[7] "Haiti's Protest." *The West Virginian*, August 11, 1915, *Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers*, Library of Congress, <https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn86072054/1915-08-11/ed-1/seq-4/>

> While the United States may have no right to assume dictatorship, even for a short time, yet it has done it in the name of humanity and to beat any similarly inclined foreign nation to the task. There has been entirely too much bloodshed in the little republic, and it is to the interests of this country to place the government on a firm foundation, to put a stop to revolutions and to enable the people to become prosperous.[8]

The assumption remained that U.S. intervention in Haiti was to be as temporary as it was necessary. This also conveys the point of view of the U.S. press on both the local and national levels that U.S. intervention was going to be mutually beneficial in terms of ending a humanitarian crisis by improving regional stability.

Examination of African-American newspapers at the time, however, reveal that a much greater level of skepticism and earlier criticism of the intervention existed within that community. Millery Polyne in *From Douglass to Duvalier* states that the black press by the fall of 1915 had diligently publicized its opposition to the U.S. intervention.[9] This study with its focus on U.S. missionaries has shown that the African-American press was certainly more critical, or at least more skeptical, of the U.S.'s intentions than their white counterparts at his stage. Already discussed was the early skepticism found in *The Crisis*, but by late 1915 as the intervention turned into an indefinite military occupation, articles regarding intervention in Haiti also appeared in *The Chicago Defender* with a far more negative assessment. In the article entitled "Haiti Captured by the United States Government," an accusation of press censorship is presented in which it is claimed that all Haitian news sources were being put under the authority of a U.S. "grand provost"

---

[8] "Haiti's Protest."
[9] Millery Polyne, *From Douglass to Duvalier: U.S. African Americans, Haiti, and Pan Americanism, 1870-1964* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2010), 57.

who by threat of arms was arresting, intimidating, fining, and imprisoning any Haitian editors who printed anything deemed critical of the U.S. occupation.[10] By December, *The Chicago Defender* voiced its own concerns about the treaty between the United States and Haiti earlier in September. Which headlines like "Haiti Betrayed", the December 11 article, "U.S. Color Line Unbearable, Says Haiti", described Haitian suspicions and fears about the intentions of an occupying nation who used color as a pretext to persecute members of its own citizenry.[11] This demonstrates that as early as 1915, there were suspicions and fears both in Haiti and within the African-American community that the occupation, rather than a humanitarian mission with the potential for transnational racial uplift, had reduced the Haitians to the status of colonial subjects.

What we see in the press reactions of 1915 to the U.S. invasion of occupation of Haiti is that the narrative shaping U.S. public opinion was largely one of the United States coming to the aid of an unstable neighbor. Any challenges in the press to this narrative at this time came solely from the African-American community, which was skeptical of the U.S.'s benevolent intentions towards Haiti. The limitations of any press critique of the Wilson administration's policy towards can be tied to the limited criticism by U.S. missionaries in Haiti at that time. In 1915, L. Ton Evans was not present in Haiti and viewed U.S. intervention there as a success, even if he had to face that his efforts had

---

[10] A. P. Holly, "Haiti Captured By United States Government," *The Chicago Defender*, October 30, 1915, retrieved from https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/493276723?accountid=14604.

[11] "U.S. Color Line Unbearable, Says Haiti," *The Chicago Defender (Big Weekend Edition) (1905-1966)*, Dec 11, 1915, 1, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/493302331?accountid=14604.

little to do with it. S.E. Churchstone Lord was critical in those early days of the occupation, but still hopeful that changes could be made. When both missionaries came to the conclusion that the occupation was irredeemable, that was when they worked towards, and succeeded in, changing political and public opinion. Furthermore, the press coverage of the occupation changes as a result of their efforts.

Press Reactions, 1920

The year 1920 marked a significant turning point in terms of how the press covered the U.S. occupation of Haiti. Not only did criticism of the occupation begin to spread across the U.S.'s racial divide, but U.S. missionaries were being cited as sources of information and opposition against U.S. policy in Haiti. As discussed in Chapter V, it is by this point where both Evans and Lord have relinquished whatever hopeful optimism they had for the occupation and are actively petitioning for it to be brought to an end. Furthermore, it is around the year 1920 that a denominational divide appeared over the issue of the occupation in which U.S. Protestant denominations whose missionaries had been allies in transnational racial uplift in the previous century were now at odds. Missionaries from the Baptist and AME denominations became outspoken critics of the occupation while Episcopalian missionaries to Haiti appealed to the press in the occupation's defense.

The missionary impact on the press accelerates around this time, first within the African-American press and over the course of the year began to spread across the racial divide. On May 15, an article appeared in *The Chicago Defender* entitled "U.S. Troops Attack Haitian Girls", which was based on an account provided by AME missionary, S.E.

Churchstone Lord.[12] Whatever initial hopes Lord had held for the occupation clearly disappeared by this point as he gave an account of nine Haitian girls between the ages of eight and twelve having died as a result of assaults by white U.S. soldiers.[13] As disturbing as this charge was, the article continued with additional crimes against the native population. Focusing particularly on charges of crimes against women, Lord also charged that the Haitian gendarmes under U.S. command had been compelled to "procure native women for use of whites as concubines".[14] Included among these charges by Lord were suggestions on what could be done in order to bring these abuses to light. According to Lord, the Haitian people sought friendship with African-Americans and appealed for prominent members of that community to visit Haiti and work within the U.S. to end these abuses.[15]

Changes in the press coverage of the occupation, resulting from missionary testimony, began to sway political and public opinion between 1918 and 1920, but it also provoked defenders of the occupation. In response to these accounts in African-American newspapers and journals, and L. Ton Evans' reports of abuses of the occupation having already fueled presidential candidate Harding's criticism of it, articles defending the

[12] "U. S. Troops Attack Haitian Girls," *The Chicago Defender (Big Weekend Edition) (1905-1966)*, May 15, 1920, retrieved from https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/493373826?accountid=14604.
[13] Ibid.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Ibid.

occupation appeared later that year. Rather than opposing the U.S. presence in Haiti, an article appeared in *The New York Times* on October 6 stating that there was no mistreatment of the local population and that the Haitians generally approved of the occupation. Already under pressure by Harding to investigate the allegations of abuse in Haiti, Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, produced a report from Marine General John A. Lejeune that the Marines had brought order and stability to Haiti, and that local Haitian officials had expressed gratitude for all they had done.[1] In the days that followed, additional inquires by Secretary Daniels would reveal a far less rosy assessment of the previous five years. On October 14, *The New York Times* would publish a follow-up story in which former Commandant General of the Marine Corps, Brigadier General George Barnett, reported that, along with subduing bandits and restoring stability for the inhabitants of Haiti, there was also evidence of "unlawful and indiscriminate killings of the natives".[2] Barnett learned that General Albertus Catlin had discovered Maj. Wells had been falsifying reports concerning these abuses and, while relieving Wells of his command and replacing the Gendarmes in the affected towns, ultimately decided to conduct no court-martials.[3] At this point, the issue of abuses from the corvée was to be given a whitewash. Majority of the 3,250 Haitians killed during the previous five years

[1] "Says Haitians Approve Our Action," *New York Times (1857-1922)*, October 6, 1920, retrieved from https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/98110047?accountid=14604
.

[2] "Reports Unlawful Killing of Haitians By Our Marines," *New York Times (1857-1922)*, Oct 14, 1920, 1, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/97868972?accountid=14604
.

[3] Robert Debs Heinl, Jr. and Nancy Gordon Heinl, *Written in Blood: The Story of the Haitian People, 1492-1971* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978), 463-464.

were attributed to actions taken to repel Caco insurgencies, but that indiscriminate killings had apparently also occurred under the revived corvée system.[4]

Coverage began to escalate at this point, and Phoenix, AZ newspaper *The Arizona Republican* reported two days later with additional information that Daniel's investigation had uncovered further evidence of abuse. The court-martial of two Marine privates over alleged indiscriminate killings during the corvée raised concerns for Daniels, but even more concerning was evidence that these incidents of abuse appeared to be tied to Major Clarke H. Wells.[5] This is significant as it ties in with the accounts of Evans' imprisonment in 1918, which he would relay to the 1921 Senate Committee. Maj. Wells had overseen operations in the north of Haiti and had been involved in trying to keep Evans imprisoned, and in the article of *The Arizona Republican* the accusations of the abuses that had occurred under Wells' command, including his orders to silence reports of abuses, were now reaching the public.[6] On both the national and regional level, the narrative of the occupation was quickly becoming much more negative and no longer only so in the African-American press. Lester Langley describes Barnett's report as the trigger point for the U.S. press to begin to turn against the occupation, however, a study

[4] Heinl & Heinl, 463-464.

[5] "Daniels Orders Complete Probe of Marine Acts On Haiti Isle," *Arizona Republican (1890 - 1922)*, Oct 16, 1920, 1, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/814556594?accountid=14604.

[6] Ibid.

of the involvement of U.S. missionaries reveals how they further fanned the flames of public outrage.[7]

U.S. missionary accounts at this time tipped the scales from the press questioning the conduct of the occupation to condemnation. Before the end of October 1920, the reports of abuses in Haiti were not only getting more press attention but were also including U.S. missionaries in the narrative. In the October 25 edition of *The New York Herald*, an article entitled "Killing of 3,250 Natives in Hayti Ignored by U.S.; Reports Are Suppressed" prominently mentioned L. Ton Evans as an earlier whistleblower who had been ignored by the Wilson administration.[8] The article presented the five-year occupation as a foreign policy scandal as the press correspondent claims to have documented proof that Baptist missionary Dr. L. Ton Evans had brought "the deplorable state of affairs in Hayti" to multiple branches of the government, including the State Department and the Department of the Navy, and was dismissed on each occasion.[9] Evans appeared in the papers again on October 28 this time in *The Washington Herald*, in which the investigation by the Navy was reportedly contemplating calling Evans to testify, but ultimately decided to only hear from direct witnesses to the specific instances being investigated.[10] The article also revealed the progression of the investigation as the

---

[7] Lester D. Langley, *The United States and the Caribbean in the Twentieth Century*. Fourth Edition (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989), 101.
[8] "Killing of 3,250 Natives in Hayti Ignored by the U.S.; Reports Are Suppressed," *The New York Herald*, October 25, 1920, Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers, Library of Congress, <https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn83045774/1920-10-25/ed-1/seq-1/>.
[9] Ibid.
[10] "Basis Of Hayti Charges Told," *The Washington Herald*, October 28, 1920, Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers, Library of Congress, <https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn83045433/1920-10-28/ed-1/seq-5/>.

number of convictions had reportedly risen from the two reported earlier to 27 convictions over the previous five years of Marines from crimes ranging from murder to unbecoming conduct.[11]

Just as the name of a Baptist missionary serving in Haiti was frequently appearing in the growing media attention to abuses of the occupation, the AME as well increased its protests of the occupation. *The New York Times* reported on November 10 that the AME Bishop in Florida, John Hurst had attended a meeting of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in New York where he called for a congressional investigation into the alleged abuses attributed to the occupation as well as reparations to the Haitian people for damages and injuries caused by the occupation.[12] As the investigation by the Navy was in the process of concluding, Hurst was convinced that a congressional investigation would better address the concerns being presented. Believing that the Naval investigation was too limited in its scope, Hurst lamented that no civilian witnesses had been called to testify, leaving only aspects of the case that fell under military affairs to be considered.[13] Hurst's concerns were supported in December when the Navy court concluded its investigation and reported no evidence of wrongdoing within the occupation. On December 19, 1920, *The New York Times* reported that the court only determined two unjustifiable homicides had been committed, that the guilty in each case had been punished, and that General Barnett had been censured on the grounds

[11] "Basis Of Hayti Charges Told."
[12] "Bishop Hurst Calls For Haitian Inquiry," *New York Times (1857-1922)*, Nov 10, 1920, 3, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/97987638?accountid=14604
[13] Ibid.

that the report he had submitted of "indiscriminate killings of natives" should not have been put in the official record.[14] Neither Baptist or AME missionaries were satisfied with this conclusion, nor would the incoming Harding administration which moved towards a congressional investigation.

One more important shift that occurred at this time was a denominational divide over how the occupation was characterized by missionaries in the press. During the nineteenth century, Baptist, AME, and Episcopal missionaries from the U.S. had all been like-minded in their goals of Haiti's national uplift as essential to transnational racial uplift for people of African descent. However, as criticism of the handling of the occupation by Baptist and AME missionaries significantly grew between 1918 and 1920, Episcopal missionaries to Haiti are shown to have taken the opposite stance. In the developing press coverage of reports of abuses against the Haitian population, Episcopal missionary, Rev. Arthur R. Gray took to the defensive of the occupation and its goals. In an article of the June 15, 1919 edition of *The Courier-Journal*, as the Latin-America Secretary of the Episcopal Mission Board, Gray described the U.S. Marines as nothing less than missionaries themselves bringing order, schools, and roads while also teaching Haitians how to treat and prevent disease and manage their finances.[15]

By the end of the following year, after reports of abuses had become far more widespread in the U.S., another article appeared in *The Courier-Journal* that attempted to

---

[14] "Navy Court Clears Marines In Haiti," *New York Times (1857-1922)*, Dec 19, 1920, 1, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/98041735?accountid=14604

[15] "Marines As Missionaries," *Courier-Journal (1869-1922)*, Jun 15, 1919, 1, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/1038651656?accountid=14604.

refute the claims made by the Baptist and AME missionaries. Episcopal Bishop-in-Charge of the Missionary District of Haiti, Rev. James Craik Morris, expressed shame that any of his fellow countrymen could make such accusations.[16] Claiming firsthand knowledge of the conduct of the occupation:

> It is a fact that the Marines have not practiced any form of cruelty. I have lived in close touch with both the natives and the Marines and I have never seen anything on the part of the officers, but an earnest, intelligent effort toward uplift of the people and bettering of conditions.[17]

So why the discrepancy between the Episcopal missionary perspective, and its reaction to the reports of abuses, from that of their Baptist and AME counterparts? The answer is most likely a matter of location. As the Episcopal mission was based in Port-au-Prince, Rev. Morris' experiences in Haiti were outside of the northern portion of Haiti where it appears most of these reported abuses occurred under the command of Maj. Wells. It is also likely that, if Morris remained in the capital during his time there, he did not interact directly with anyone involved in the corvée while it was in effect, as this policy was applied to infrastructure projects outside of Port-au-Prince. Because Evans worked farther north, he put himself more in a position to experience the impact of the corvée. With differing experiences of the occupation, as reports of abuses found their way into the U.S. press, it created a denominational divide by 1920 over the issue of Haiti.

---

[16] "Haiti Cruelty Charge Denied," *Courier-Journal (1869-1922)*, Dec 04, 1920, 9, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/1023740990?accountid=14604.

[17] Ibid.

Breakdown of Support, 1921-1934

Baptist and AME missionary testimonies irrevocably shifted political and public opinion of the occupation by the time the official government inquiry was conducted. As the Naval investigation concluded in 1920 and the congressional investigation began the following year, press coverage of the occupation from that point on would prove to be overwhelmingly critical. S.E. Churchstone Lord would again appear in *The Chicago Defender* on June 4, 1921 as his letter to then-President Harding giving reasons for the U.S. to withdraw from Haiti was published.[18] In the letter, Lord reveals that the events in Haiti had led him to resign his position as superintendent of the African Methodist Episcopal Church there for the express purpose of bringing greater U.S. public attention to the abuses of the occupation.[19] Much like Evans had done earlier, Lord used his new role to add political as well as public pressure to further investigate the charges of abuse. The article describes how Lord worked with Bishop Hurst to appeal to Missouri Congressman Leonidas Dyer concerning the Haiti issue.[20] To convey the severity of the abuses being reported in Haiti, Lord stated to President Harding and the overall population that "the white mothers and fathers of America, who are fighting white slavery in this country, if you condone the presence of the American marines in Haiti you will be guilty of a more devilish lynch law than is known in America".[21] While Lord was

[18] S. E. Churchstone Lord, "U.S. Marines Should Get Out Of Haitian Republic," *The Chicago Defender (National Edition) (1921-1967)*, Jun 4, 1921, 14, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/491905987?accountid=14604.
[19] Ibid.
[20] Ibid.
[21] Ibid.

not as directly involved in the Senate hearings as Evans was, his frequent appearance in the press at this time reveals that he too took on the role of applying political pressure.

Shortly after Lord's article in *The New York Times* another article, though not containing mention of missionaries or their criticism, describes the reaction of occupational forces to the increased scrutiny in the Harding administration and the press. On June 14, the *Times* reported that a new censorship measure was being put into effect in Haiti. Under orders by Colonel John H. Russell, all articles or speeches attacking U.S. forces, the President of Haiti, or the Haitian government were to be prohibited and offenders were to be tried by military court-martial.[22] The rationale behind it, according to Col. Russell, was not to infringe on the freedom of the press but to prevent incendiary writings that could be used to stir up greater violence against the occupation.[23] The article itself neither outright supports or condemns this censorship measure, but it appeared at a time when the press no longer gave the occupation the benefit of the doubt. The absence of any language about the benefits to public order, which had been present in press articles prior to 1920, signified this shift in the press's overall perspective.

From late 1921 through the remainder of the occupation, African-American criticism and condemnation continued to accelerate. On September 5, 1921, the Pan-African Congress unanimously adopted a resolution to protest the U.S. occupation of Haiti.[24] Coverage of the occupation in *The Chicago Defender* by 1922, with the Senate

---

[22] "Court-Martial Now For Haiti's Civilians," *New York Times (1857-1922)*, Jun 14, 1921, 14, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/98432593?accountid=14604
[23] Ibid.
[24] "Denounce Our Haiti Policy," *New York Times (1857-1922)*, Sep 06, 1921, 15, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/98363860?accountid=14604

hearings having revealed publicly by this point the extent of the abuses of the occupation, told a narrative in which the Haitians were victims of blatant racial violence and Baptist and AME missionaries were martyrs on their behalf. In the article entitled "U.S. Marines Revive Slavery in Haiti", *The Chicago Defender* described a situation in Haiti that it referred to as "Worse Than Slavery" on the premise that, even slaveholders in the U.S. South before the U.S. Civil War had "fed, clothed and housed their slaves" and yet "Haitians were not so fortunate".[25] This was in reference to the corvée system revived temporarily by the U.S. occupation that often employed forced, unpaid labor to build the roads and infrastructure, which had served as the main evidence of defense for the merits of the occupation.

This lengthy article continued with stories of missionary criticism and resistance against the occupation and is unique as it features both S.E. Churchstone Lord and L. Ton Evans. Included is an account where Lord had endeared himself to both the Haitian people in general as well as Haitian President Dartiguenave for acts such as walking with a child in front of the firing line to halt Marine fire on a group of natives.[26] Evans was prominently mentioned in his role of describing for the U.S. Senate the "atrocities of U.S. marines under orders from their officers", and for his reports of voter suppression by the occupation forces during Haitian elections.[27] One further mention of religion having played an antagonistic role against the U.S. occupation was the accusation that non-

---

[25] Judson King, "U.S. Marines Revive Slavery In Haiti," *The Chicago Defender (National Edition) (1921-1967)*, June 10, 1922, 2, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/491920412?accountid=14604.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid.

Protestant services had been suppressed. According to a cablegram received on April 8, 1922 from the League of Young Haitians, that Catholic officials had been prohibited from officiating a misconcordia mass for 5,000 people at the Cathedral at Port-au-Prince, which had been called for on behalf of the stress of the people.[28] The motives for such a prohibition were likely in relation to the previously enacted censorship of the Haitian press in that such a service could have proved incendiary. Regardless of the motivation, the move was perceived as the U.S. forces further imposing on Haitian life and culture. While Protestant missionaries had been an antagonistic force on the Haitian's behalf, Catholicism was far more widespread in Haiti, and therefore suppressing a mass would have been perceived as a form of further suppressing Haitian national identity.

In the years following the 1921 hearings, the accounts of missionaries witnessing, and enduring, abuses in Haiti by occupational forces had succeeded in generating greater political oversight and greater public scrutiny. By 1928, the abuses of the early years of the occupation had been brought to light and the U.S. was already transitioning towards eventual withdrawal once post-occupation stability could be ensured. However, press articles revealed that the damage to the U.S.'s image among the Haitian population had been done. In an article published in *The New York Times* on February 19, 1928, there is a return to the earlier descriptions of a positive U.S. impact of establishing order, managing finances, and construction of public works, sanitation systems, and rural farms.[29] This time, however, these achievements that had been lauded in the press prior

[28] King, 2.
[29] Clarence K Streit, "Intervention Irks Proud Haitian Folk," *New York Times (1923-Current File)*, Feb 19, 1928, 51,

to 1920 were now being treated with skepticism. The article continues to say that the "doubtful foundations" of these achievements has done nothing to win the friendship of Haiti or the Haitian people.[30] By this point, neither the Haitian people nor the U.S. press appear to see any benefit to the continuation of the U.S. occupation.

Several elements changed in the language used by the press to describe the U.S. occupation. Reports of abuses no longer found their way into the newspapers, nor did further protests of them by U.S. missionaries, indicating that the 1921 Senate hearings were successful in bringing pressure to reform the occupation. Nevertheless, the language used to describe the occupation by the late 1920s never returned to the praise for U.S. intervention that had existed before the missionary protests. Attempts to reform the occupation did not reverse this, and the language of both the U.S. press and Haitian protesters had simply shifted from outrage to fatigue. The aforementioned article in *The New York Times* claimed to have interviewed Haitians who, though not inherently hostile to the continued U.S. presence in Haiti, stated their grievance as "our country may be backward, but it is all we have. We fought for it and it is our own. We feel that it is slipping away from us, into the hands of the Americans".[31]

Indirectly, this can be seen as a way that U.S. missionaries again gave the Haitian people a voice in these events. Having drawn U.S. press attention to the abuses earlier in the decade, this attention created in large part by missionaries later resulted in press

---

https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/104631374?accountid=14604.

[30] Streit, 51.

[31] Ibid.

interviews with the Haitians themselves. Yet, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of that voice, especially as it appears in the press, as it is likely limited to a select group of people within Haitian society. The previous quotation was said to have come from "the articulate minority, where Haitian pride is strongest", which the article states is referring to the urban mulatto class containing a small black minority.[32] While the press indeed provided a direct Haitian voice to the situation, it was from a very small segment of that society and from one that was largely separated from the majority of the population in terms of race and social status. The earlier missionary protests on behalf of the Haitians were an indirect way of hearing the Haitian perspective, but it arguably provided more of the voice of the majority rather than the Haitian social elite.

While focusing on the views of the Haitian elite, the U.S. press also highlighted an ongoing issue with the continued occupation in the form of centralized control. Much of the feeling among the Haitians interviewed of their country slipping "into the hands of the Americans" was from the belief that power was still being centralized towards the U.S. administration without Haitian inclusion.[33] The U.S. was already working towards its eventual withdrawal from Haiti, but the methods by which it achieved progress in stabilizing Haiti seemed by the elites to lack a long-term vision. With administration of Haiti being conducted at this point directly by the U.S. in conjunction with the Haitian president, the system was seen as favoring getting material work done quickly and efficiently but not in producing a system of long-term self-governance.[34] In other words,

[32] Streit, 51.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid.

by not including the elites more in the transition of governance, they felt they were not being prepared for when the U.S. eventually did leave.

The language of fatigue over the continued occupation in Haiti was further expressed in an article for *The New York Times* on May 20, 1928. The article was a review of a recent book entitled *Black Democracy: The Story of Haiti* by H.P. Davis, which told the story of the causes of the U.S. intervention in 1915 and the problems that faced the ongoing occupation.[35] In keeping with the general attitude expressed by the U.S. press, and reportedly by the Haitians as well, the article described the book as even in its assessment of U.S. actions since 1915.

> If any reader expects the author to coddle the Haitians and abuse General Russell and his marines, a disappointment awaits him; on the other hand, if the my-country-right-or-wrong patriot expects the author to overlook flaws in the American plan for the training of the Haitians in democracy and blunders in its execution, he will soon be disillusioned.[36]

Nevertheless, Davis, as relayed by the author of the article, suggested that it was not too late to correct these errors. Mentioning that the occupation treaty had been extended to continue through 1936 (ten years longer than the original treaty had stated) due to continued unrest and Caco resistance outside the capital, Davis suggested in the final chapters "Haiti Today" and "What Is To Be Done?" that the remaining time should be spent preparing the Haitians for self-governance through appointing a civilian High

---

[35] Henry E. Armstrong, "In Haiti we Try to Build a Government by the People," *New York Times (1923-Current File)*, May 20, 1928, 56, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/104557415?accountid=14604.

[36] Ibid.

Commissioner to cooperate with educated Haitians, restore parliamentary government, separate the military from all civil functions, and reduce the U.S. military presence in Haiti to a minimum.[37]

By the end of the following year, press reports reveal that the U.S. government too was fatigued by the occupation. In an article in *The New York Times* dated December 7, 1929, it was announced that President Hoover was going to send 500 marines to an undisclosed location abroad, and that the prevailing assumption was that they were to reinforce the 700 marines still stationed in Haiti.[38] Whether or not Haiti was the intended destination, the article included indications that Hoover was more interested in reducing military commitments abroad than expanding upon them. Hoover had recently told the U.S. Congress that his goal was to begin withdrawing marines from foreign soil whenever and wherever feasible, and that, while he hoped reduce forces soon in Nicaragua and China, Haiti posed "a much more difficult problem, the solution of which is still obscure".[39] This added credence to the suspicion of Haiti as the destination of the additional 500 marines being deployed, but it also was indicative of the growing problems faced by the U.S. both at home and in Haiti.

As 1929 marked the beginning of a sharp economic decline in the U.S. that ultimately resulted in the Great Depression, that Hoover was interested in reducing military expenditures abroad is understandable. The situation in Haiti, however, was

---

[37] Armstrong, 56.

[38] "Rushing Marines To Haiti, Hoover To Tell Congress Of Troubles There Today," *New York Times (1923-Current File)*, Dec 07, 1929, 1, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/104824426?accountid=14604.

[39] Ibid.

proving difficult for the U.S. to extricate itself from without leaving the nation in chaos. Popular unrest in Haiti was on the rise, though the article in *The New York Times* suggested a different source for the unrest than with earlier insurgencies. Rather than Caco guerillas, much of the unrest was originating from the students, laborers, and the ruling class in Haiti.[40] The article indicated that the reason for growing unrest from this sector of Haitian society was due to their continued exclusion from government control. Rather than heeding the advice from Davis' book the previous year, no civilian commissioner had been appointed to cooperate with the Haitian elites and General Russell had remained High Commissioner of Haiti.[41] The frustration of the Haitian elite was now reported to have escalated to the point that martial law would once again have to be imposed.[42]

Months later another article appeared in *The New York Times* which confirmed Hoover's intentions to end the occupation of Haiti. The article dated February 5, 1930 carried President Hoover's insistence that the withdrawal be a gradual one in keeping with the projected end date of 1936. In response to some critics (Hoover did not specify whom) who suggested a more immediate withdrawal, Hoover countered with the statement that he had been informed "that every group in Haiti considers that such action would result in disaster to the Haitian people".[43] Hoover concluded with a praise for the work of the occupation, though unlike the praise seen in the press prior to 1920, the intent

---

[40] "Rushing Marines To Haiti, Hoover To Tell Congress Of Troubles There Today," 1.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.
[43] "Hoover Aims To End Our Stay In Haiti," *New York Times (1923-Current File)*, Feb 05, 1930, 1, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/99054857?accountid=14604
.

is not to justify the occupation but to make the argument that it is no longer necessary. Expressing his desire for the U.S. government not to represent itself abroad with military force, Hoover described the "chaotic and distressing conditions" that led to intervention in 1915, and that the present state of Haiti was one of order and peace restored, economy developed, and infrastructure successfully built.[44] Neither Hoover, nor the article, make any mention of the early abuses of the occupation that had made the headlines a decade earlier.

This is not to say that the public debate over the continued U.S. presence in Haiti had disappeared entirely. Despite a general fatigue seen in the press coverage over the occupation, though seemingly a willingness at the time to wait until 1936, one article later that month reveals that W.E.B. Du Bois had not dropped his criticism. An article in *The New York Times* reported an incident on February 20, 1930, where Du Bois, along with Captain F.H. Cooke of the U.S. Navy were speaking at a meeting of the International Relations Committee of the Women's Club of Orange, NJ.[45] There, Du Bois asserted that the motives for U.S. involvement in Haiti were not altruistic, but rather were based solely on the desires of the National City Bank of New York.[46] Revealing that there were still those in U.S. society that advocated for the occupation despite the earlier reported abuses, members of the Committee became defensive and accused Du Bois of being "an emissary of the Soviet government".[47] This would indicate that, at least in the

[44] "Hoover Aims To End Our Stay In Haiti," 1.
[45] "Debate On Haiti Rouses Women's Club," *New York Times (1923-Current File)*, Feb 21, 1930, 10, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/99042489?accountid=14604
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid.

years that followed, the earlier impact of missionary protests and press coverage had failed to change public opinion of the occupation in the long-term. However, the conclusion if the article suggests that those in favor of the occupation were a minority. Though no missionaries are mentioned in the article, it was reported that calm in the meeting was eventually restored by one Reverend Dascomb Forbush who was present, that both speakers parted on friendly terms, that Dr. Du Bois was applauded by a majority of the audience, and that the heckling he had received was in his words "all done by a small group of women who seemed to be incensed at the idea that the United States ever did anything wrong".[48] So, while it appears that condemnation of the occupation was not universal by 1930, praise for it was far more limited than it had been prior to 1920 and that most of the U.S. public was eager for it to end.

As would be reported in *The New York Times* in October of 1932, Haitians were increasingly eager for the occupation to end as well. While President Hoover had insisted that every group in Haiti wanted the U.S. to leave in due time, it was unclear at to what "every group in Haiti" actually referred to and potentially untrue as Haitian protests for the U.S. to withdrawal increased. In *The New York Times* article entitled "Proud Haiti Demands Her Old Freedom", the author describes an understanding by the protesting Haitians that order had been restored, finances managed, and all the other lauded aspects of the occupation, and yet had nevertheless grown impatient as the sluggish fulfillment of President's Hoover promise to withdraw.[49] Citing a growing sense of Haitian nationalism

[48] "Debate On Haiti Rouses Women's Club," 10.
[49] Harold N. Denny, "Proud Haiti Demands Her Old Freedom," *New York Times (1923-Current File)*, Oct 09, 1932, 2,

and desire for restored independence, article author Harold Denny explained that "The Haitians, like most other people, would rather govern themselves, even if they should govern themselves badly, than be well governed by someone else".[50] This growing sense of Haitian nationalism, as discussed in chapter 4, would eventually overtake the U.S. timetable and the troop withdrawal would occur in 1934 rather than the scheduled end point of 1936. As press reports from the period of 1921 onward reveal, fatigue over the occupation was shared by the Haitians who demanded their independence restored to them regardless of an effective transition, and the Americans (government, press, and public) who no longer were willing to withhold it.

While missionaries were largely absent from the press reports of the occupation after the 1921 Senate hearings brought the earlier abuses to light, the political and public view of the occupation had been shaped by their testimonies, and one final article by *The New York Times* brings closure to the impact of one missionary in particular. On March 31, 1933, *The New York Times* printed the obituary for Reverend L. Ton Evans. It was reported that Evans had died in his home in Wyoming, PA on March 30 having suffered a heart attack while conversing amongst family.[51] While his run-ins with the U.S. occupational administration in Haiti were not mentioned, the article described him first and foremost as a Baptist pastor and missionary to Haiti.[52] Having died in 1933, the

---

https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/100480300?accountid=14604.

[50] Ibid.

[51] "Rev. L Ton Evans," *New York Times (1923-Current File)*, Mar 31, 1933, 19, https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/100549614?accountid=14604.

[52] "Rev. L Ton Evans," 19.

withdrawal of U.S. forces from Haiti and the end of nineteen years of military occupation there in 1934 is bittersweet, as Evans did not live to see the fruits of his labor of advocating Haitian independence. Nevertheless, it is clear from the evidence presented that he and S.E. Churchstone Lord played a significant role in shaping, and ultimately ending, the U.S. occupation of Haiti.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

During the U.S. occupation of Haiti between 1915 and 1934, U.S. Baptist and AME missionaries proved influential in how the U.S. administered, and eventually ended, its policies towards Haiti. The missionaries, L. Ton Evans and S.E. Churchstone Lord, were the key figures from their respective denominations whose efforts altered the U.S. administration of Haiti. While their efforts to sway U.S. policy towards Haiti prior to the intervention, and later to convince both politicians and the U.S. public to end the occupation, were unique to the circumstances of the intervention and occupation, this adapted role of the U.S. missionary was built upon the role that their predecessors had established in the nineteenth century. The relationship between the United States and Haiti, tied together in their mutual movements towards independence from the European powers, while also divided over the issues of slavery and race, shaped the role of the nineteenth century, U.S. missionary. During the first half of the nineteenth century, the debate on abolition in the U.S. led African-American Baptists and AME missionaries to Haiti, where they often found themselves working directly with the Haitian government to build Haiti up as a haven for people of African descent. During the latter half of the nineteenth, and early twentieth, century, these missionaries continued to work with Haiti with the goal of showing the world the efficacy of black self-governance. African-

American missionaries believed that the success of "The Black Republic" was tied to the success of all people of African descent.

L. Ton Evans and S.E. Churchstone Lord both inherited the nineteenth century-established belief that the role of the missionary in Haiti was to provide Haitians with the spiritual and technical education that they believed to be vital to building up the Haitian nation. What forced the evolution of that role in the early twentieth century was the belief that the increased political unrest, and Haiti's seeming inability to develop into a stable and prosperous nation, at this time was the result of increased outside interference. For Evans, it was his firm belief that German interference was largely responsible for destabilizing Haiti between 1911 and 1915. For Lord and others of the AME, there were some who agreed that Germany had played a part, but some were also willing to expand that list of countries to include the U.S. What both Evans and the AME agreed on was that the United States, as Haiti's most powerful neighbor, had a part to play in bringing stability and prosperity to Haiti. Where they disagreed during the intervention period was in what way the U.S. should be involved.

What the Missionaries Did and Did Not Accomplish

While Lord and Evans had adapted their roles as missionaries to include political activism before and during the occupation, their efforts at shaping U.S. policy towards Haiti around 1915 were unsuccessful. Evans spent the years prior to 1915 petitioning the U.S. government to become militarily involved in Haiti to restore order there. Lord and the AME felt that more should be done in terms of U.S. support to Haiti, but were reluctant to call for any actions that would make Haiti a client state of the U.S. For the

AME, Haiti needed support, but needed to succeed largely on its own to symbolize black self-governance. Despite Evans's efforts to influence U.S. intervention in Haiti before 1915, and Lord's efforts to suggest changes at the onset of the occupation, there is no evidence that their efforts had any impact on U.S. policy. All evidence suggests that President Wilson never even saw Evans's letters, and that the administration's information on Haiti came primarily from U.S. businessmen, operating in Haiti, with motives that even the administration later found questionable. Furthermore, none of the suggestions Lord made to the administration in 1915, concerning ways that the occupation could be more effective and beneficial to the Haitian people, were adopted at this time. The role of the U.S. missionary in Haiti had changed to include political activism by 1915, but this role had not yet yielded any success.

That changed in 1918 as both L. Ton Evans and S.E. Churchstone Lord reported abuses against the Haitian population by U.S. occupational forces. Particularly when the U.S. occupation resurrected the defunct Haitian law of the corvée in order to streamline infrastructure development around and outside Port-au-Prince did reports of abuses increase along with Haitian resentment to the U.S. presence. As reports of abuses mounted, and Evans himself endured temporary incarceration, the two missionaries became antagonistic against the U.S. administration of Haiti, and this is where they successfully influenced policy. Evans, whom the Wilson administration had dismissed, and in some ways targeted, found allies in the Harding administration. His protests of abuses against the Haitians were acknowledged and entered into testimony as the new administration launched an official inquiry. Lord succeeded at the same time in creating

political and public pressure against U.S. policy in Haiti as he wrote to the NAACP, who in turn pressured the government to take action.

The press coverage before and after 1920 revealed that these actions significantly altered how the occupation was portrayed as a result of these missionary reports and testimonies. Furthermore, the U.S. government, while it did not yet believe that it could withdraw the occupation, took steps afterward to reform the occupation while it continued. As a result of bringing the previous abuses to political and public attention, these missionaries succeeded in bringing these abuses to an end. Censorship of the press and suppression of Haitian democracy continued through the remainder of the occupation, but stories of atrocities against Haitians and forced labor were no longer being reported by missionaries in Haiti. Also gone as a result of the missionaries' testimonies were press narratives that gave those lingering questionable practices of the occupation the benefit of the doubt.

What Set These Two Missionaries Apart

While greater political activism on behalf of Haiti was a shared aspect for Evans and Lord of the role of U.S. missionaries in Haiti, what motivated these two men to act on Haiti's behalf were significantly different. S.E. Churchstone Lord had the most in common with the Baptist and AME missionaries who preceded him to Haiti in the nineteenth century. They too were African-Americans who felt that to bring technical and spiritual education to Haiti would not only bring greater prosperity and stability to Haiti, but in so doing would also help build a nation that served as an example of black accomplishment and self-governance to the world. For Lord, the AME, and their

forebearers in nineteenth century, Haiti was a symbol whose status in the world impacted them spiritually, racially, and personally as African-Americans. If they could inspire change in Haiti, they could do so in the United States and elsewhere.

Evans's motivations set him apart, who, as a white, Welsh immigrant to the United States, did not have the same kind of personal investment in Haiti's future. Haiti's success or failure as a nation, from Evans's perspective, did not affect how he felt society viewed him and his status within it. What Haiti did symbolize for him was a nation of people who needed an advocate. Not because they could not succeed on their own, but because, Evans believed, external forces manipulated Haitian politics, making it impossible without the help of the United States to prevent further interference. Based on the evidence presented, as a missionary, L. Ton Evans cannot be described as an agent of U.S. imperialism. While Evans did initially view Haitian cultural aspects such as voudou as the primary cause of the nation's problems, and Protestant Christian practices as the solution, this view changed to believe that outside interference was the more serious issue. He came to believe that the Haitians could accomplish prosperity and stability on their own if only given the chance.

Evans did believe that the United States would and should be involved in stabilizing Haiti, but only based on the belief that Haiti would be protected by a strong hand rather than becoming a client state. When Evans called for U.S. intervention, it was with the intent that the U.S. would use its power to remove foreign interference and block it from manipulating Haiti in the future. When Evans realized that the occupation had suppressed Haitian democracy in favor of U.S. military rule, he became critical while still

hoping the Wilson administration would see the error of its ways. When Evans became aware of the occupation's increasing abuse of the Haitian population, he turned antagonistic towards U.S. rule in Haiti. What we see in Evans is a missionary who viewed the Haitians as pitiable, but fully capable of achieving prosperity if allowed by the outside world to do so and viewed himself in solidarity with them. His perceived bond with them was strictly religious, in contrast to nineteenth century and later AME missionaries who shared both spiritual and racial bonds with the Haitians, and this overruled any national or racial bond he felt he shared with his adoptive nation.

Another significant difference between Evans and Lord was their relationship with their denominational organizations as their missionary roles evolved. The AME was skeptical of the U.S. government's intentions, and apprehensive of what having to rely on U.S. intervention would mean for Haiti as a symbol, from the beginning of the occupation. Therefore, when Lord expressed his doubts and concerns to the AME and the NAACP, he found himself in solidarity with the organizations with which he coordinated. As he increased his criticisms of the occupation, he continued to receive the support of the AME. Evans's experience was different. As he grew more critical of the occupation, his organization, the Lott Carey Mission Board, began to distance itself from him. Evidence shows that the Mission Board came under scrutiny by the Wilson administration as a result of Evans's political activities, and in turn attempted to pressure him to cease his activities. Whereas the AME and NAACP were willing to apply pressure to the U.S. government over the occupation of Haiti, the Lott Carey Mission Board sought to remove pressure that they were receiving from the government. Evans persisted

in spite of requests to cease, though, unlike Lord, he appeared to have continued his appeals to the government to reform, and later end, the occupation without the support of this sponsoring organization.

Significance

In the cases of L. Ton Evans and S.E. Churchstone Lord in Haiti, as well as the U.S. missionaries to Haiti that preceded them in the nineteenth century, the role of U.S. missionaries has been shown to be significant to gaining a greater understanding of the history of U.S. foreign policy towards the Caribbean and Latin America in the early twentieth century. Neither irrelevant enough to warrant their previous omission from the historiography nor simply serving as agents of U.S. capitalism, U.S. missionaries in pre-occupied and occupied Haiti served as intermediaries and advocates for the Haitian people and attempted to modify or directly challenge U.S. administration there. While efforts to partner or guide U.S. action in Haiti failed to directly impact the administration, those efforts by Evans and Lord all the same demonstrate U.S. missionaries were active advocates before and during the 1915 intervention. Their more direct impacts came when persistent abuses against the Haitian population pushed these missionaries to include active protests and political pressure as part of their advocacy.

Without examining the actions of these two missionaries, and the traditions of U.S. missionary activism in Haiti built during the previous century, our understanding of these events is otherwise limited to U.S. political and economic interests that only provide a purely U.S. perspective without a sense of the Haitian response to them. While, admittedly, direct Haitian voices and perspectives of these events remain outside of reach

at the conclusion of this study, the grievances and protests offered by Evans and Lord offer at least something different. These were accounts from people who interacted with Haitians regularly, and in Evans's case offers the perspective of an American who experienced first-hand something of the abuses that the Haitians had suffered. These accounts therefore are set apart from previous analysis based on political and military reports and investigations, which were largely dismissive of these abuses. Evans and Lord are not Haitian voices, but they at the very least assumed that their voices spoke for the Haitians. How accurately they spoke for Haitians is a lingering question, but their perspectives are unique in that they were based on what they believed were Haitian interests putting them in contrast with previously studied perspectives that were filtered through U.S. interests. Once again building on Trouillot's thesis, while Haitian and U.S. missionary resistance to the U.S. occupation may have been unthinkable, it can no longer be ignored as U.S. missionaries played too significant a role in these events and their conclusion.

Was Haiti an Anomaly?

Having demonstrated the actions and significance of U.S. missionaries during the U.S. occupation of Haiti, one final question remains as to how this dynamic fits into the larger story of U.S. intervention in the region during the early twentieth century. What a brief comparative analysis of the parallel U.S. occupations of Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic reveal is that U.S. missionaries becoming outspoken advocates against their home government's occupation during this time was an occurrence that was unique to occupied Haiti. There are several key factors that set the occupation of Haiti

and the role of U.S. Baptist and AME missionaries apart from the U.S. occupations of Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic. First, the motivations of the U.S. to militarily intervene in Haiti differed somewhat from those for the Dominican Republic, and significantly from those for Nicaragua. In both Haiti and the Dominican Republic, chronic political unrest threatened both nations with economic collapse and with it the threat of European intervention as the two nations' debts went into default. Out of pre-existing U.S. policy in the region based on the Monroe Doctrine, and from President Wilson's policy of maintaining order in the region, which he prioritized over Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy, the U.S. government became much more hands on in Haitian and Dominican affairs. As the two nations both became even more politically unstable after 1911, the U.S. eventually opted to take direct control over both to restore order and maintain U.S. dominance in the region against European interference or incursions.

What set Haiti and the Dominican Republic apart in these motivations is that, while both order and security were U.S. concerns in each case, the issue in Haiti stemmed from a balance of order and security concerns whereas the issue in the Dominican Republic stemmed more from a desire to simply restore order. In the case of Haiti, the significant presence of German business interests, the role they had allegedly played in destabilizing the Haitian government, and the strategic port of Mole St. Nicholas at the mouth of the vital trade route of the Windward Passage all made the collapsing political situation there unacceptable for the Wilson administration. By contrast, the Dominican Republic lacked a European threat to its economic and political systems as the U.S. already dominated those areas prior to occupation. Therefore, the specific threat of

Germany was not there as German businessmen did not have the opportunities for economic control that were available in preoccupation Haiti, neither was Samana Bay either seen as coveted by foreign interests nor located in an area as strategically threatening to U.S. interests as Mole St. Nicholas. For the U.S., the occupation of the Dominican Republic was about restoring political and economic order.

The motivations for U.S. intervention in Nicaragua were significantly different. While political unrest was ultimately the trigger, this was not a case as in Haiti or the Dominican Republic where one government after another fell until U.S. Marines were sent to establish a new U.S.-supported government. The conservative Nicaraguan government, threatened by leftist rebellions, turned to the United States and specifically requested Marines to be sent, not to replace the government, but to keep the current government in power. The U.S.-allied Dominican president had unsuccessfully resisted the use of U.S. troops, which in turn took full control of the government there. The Haitian government was simply replaced by U.S. military force without any debate on the matter, only fulfilling warnings that had preceded military action.

The second factor that set the occupation of Haiti apart was its duration by comparison to the other two occupied territories. The U.S. military occupation of Nicaragua was technically the longest of the three beginning in 1912 and ending in 1934. However, this occupation is very distinction from the other two as it was requested as a supplemental support to the pre-existing Nicaraguan government and had originally been scheduled to end in 1927. Renewed threats of rebellion against the Nicaraguan government forced U.S. troops to quickly return that year in order to maintain that

government. Haiti on the other hand was under direct U.S. administrative control from 1915 until the final withdrawal of troops in 1934. While the 1921 Senate hearings brought to light the early years of mismanagement of the occupation in Haiti, the country was still deemed too unstable to be able to function if U.S. forces withdrew. The Dominican Republic, however, was deemed after these hearings to be closer to its goals for restoring order and a gradual withdrawal was soon agreed upon. This made the duration of the occupation of the Dominican Republic from 1916 to 1924 the shortest of the three.

Aside from the differing circumstances and execution of the three occupations, the third key factor that made the situation in occupied Haiti unique was the missionary denominations involved before and during the occupation. Haiti, as part of its historical status as a symbol of black liberation, had attracted the attention of missionaries from the Baptists, Episcopalians, and the African Methodist Episcopal Church. African-Americans from each of these organizations during the nineteenth century saw bringing Christian education to Haiti as a means of both serving God and providing transnational racial uplift to a nation that had come to be a symbol of black self-governance. By the time of the U.S. occupation, the predominant missionaries serving there was Welsh-born Baptist and U.S. citizen, L. Ton Evans, and S.E. Churchstone Lord of the AME Church. The AME presence in Haiti had ebbed and flowed since the nineteenth century, but a presence remained well into the occupation. The Baptists on the other hand, had periodically established themselves in Haiti temporarily throughout the nineteenth century, and the

perseverance of L. Ton Evans resulted in a pioneer Baptist missionary presence just before, and then during the U.S. occupation.

The missionary demographics of the other two occupied nations are quite different. There was no significant Baptist presence in the Dominican Republic before or during the U.S. occupation, either in terms of concerted efforts by Baptist mission boards to establish work there or by a single individual like Evans pushing to pioneer work there. On the other hand, like Haiti, the AME had managed to enter the Dominican Republic while it was under Haitian rule during the mid-nineteenth century and remain there. In spite of the political instability on both sides of Hispaniola that had doomed previous missions, the AME was able to build and maintain a community at Samana that survived to see U.S. forces take control of the region. Nicaragua again differs significantly in that the Baptists, while only having a pioneer presence in Haiti and a negligible presence in the Dominican Republic, had a significant, organized, and coordinated presence there. In further contrast to the two nations of occupied Hispaniola, the AME presence in Nicaragua was negligible.

Finally, the fourth key factor in understanding Haiti's unique situation during the concurring occupations is the role that U.S. missionaries played during the U.S. occupations. The ultimate goal of this project has been to demonstrate that U.S. Baptist and AME missionaries in Haiti played a significant role in shaping, and eventually ending, the U.S. occupation. To that end, this project explored how Baptist missionary, L. Ton Evans, petitioned for U.S. intervention in the political crises of Haiti prior to 1915 only to later become an outspoken critic of the subsequent occupation. At the same time,

AME missionary, S.E. Churchstone Lord, appealed directly to W.E.B Dubois and the NAACP concerning the abuses of the occupation, who in turn petitioned the new Harding administration directly to address these abuses. While these petitions failed to end the occupation of Haiti at the time of the 1921 Senate hearings, they nevertheless brought these issues to light for a more sympathetic administration who in turn pursued reforms and greater oversight of the occupation there.

In contrast, the impact of U.S. Baptist and AME missionaries in Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic ranged from minimal to non-existent. As mentioned earlier, there was no pioneering Baptist in the Dominican Republic that petitioned the U.S. government to take actions either before or during the U.S. occupation. Furthermore, while the AME did have a presence in both Haiti and the Dominican Republic, there does not appear to be an Evans or a Lord equivalent who compiled a memorandum or list of grievances to submit to the Senate committee for the Dominican Republic as had been done for Haiti. In their petition to the Senate Committee, the NAACP spoke of reports of abuses but nothing so structured as what Evans and Lord had produced. In Nicaragua, there does not appear to have been any critique of the U.S. occupation on the part of U.S. missionaries. There does not appear to have been any AME presence to speak of, and the significant Baptist presence offered nothing akin to Evans's memorandum. This is likely due to the differing nature of the Nicaragua occupation, and the fact that the hostility of the local population to the Baptist presence did not produce circumstances where the missionaries were inclined to speak on their behalf. It is also likely that these

missionaries, threatened as they were by the native population, looked to the occupying force as their sole means of protection.

After analyzing these comparative and contrasting elements of the occupations of Haiti, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic, the role of U.S. missionaries as political activists on behalf of the population before and during the U.S. occupation of Haiti appears to be an occurrence that is unique to Haiti. The U.S. government motivations and administration, as well as the missionary activities there were significantly different from those seen in Nicaragua. U.S. government motivations for intervention and administration of the occupation that followed, while sharing similarities, were quite different for the Dominican Republic than in Haiti. No strategic threat appears to have weighed on the minds of the Wilson administration to the extent that Haiti had. Furthermore, the missionaries there, while relaying some information to interested African-American and Dominican independence groups, were not nearly as vocal or active in trying to shape or end the U.S. occupation in the Dominican Republic as their contemporaries had been in Haiti. The evidence therefore suggests that the role of U.S. missionaries within the U.S. occupation of Haiti was unique to Haiti and not part of a larger pattern within U.S.-occupied Caribbean and Latin American territories in the early twentieth century.

U.S. Missionaries in the History of the U.S. Occupation of Haiti (1915-1934)

What this study has revealed is that U.S. missionaries L. Ton Evans and S.E. Churchstone Lord played a significant role in bringing the abuses of the corvée to an end, and also helped to end the occupation of Haiti by eroding public support. Building on a

tradition established by previous Baptist, Episcopal, and AME missionaries to Haiti, these two missionaries became advocates for the Haitian people to an extent their predecessors had not. While U.S. missionaries had acted as go-betweens for Haitians and the Haitian and U.S. governments, Evans and Lord's advocacy went as far as to challenge the policies of their own government. Evans used appeals to Wilson at first, and later to Wilson's political rivals, to bring Congressional scrutiny to the conduct of the occupation. Lord used his connections within the AME and NAACP to bring greater public attention within the African-American community to the abuses in Haiti, which in turn also pressed for the Congressional scrutiny that came in 1921. Both influenced the U.S. press coverage in a way that brought abuses of the Haitian people to light and soured the U.S. public's opinion over maintaining the occupation. Their role in these shifts in political and public opinion regarding the occupation demonstrates the historical importance of missionaries in influencing U.S. foreign policy and refutes the traditional historiographical conclusion that U.S. missionaries in the Caribbean and Latin American region during the early twentieth century were merely agents of empire. What this study shows is that the role of U.S. missionaries in the U.S. intervention and occupation of Haiti is relevant to our understanding of these events, and how their role at that time was unique among the U.S.-occupied nations in the region.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Armstrong, Henry E. "In Haiti we Try to Build a Government by the People." *New York Times (1923-Current File)*, May 20, 1928. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/104557415?accountid=14604.

Balch, Emily Greene. *Occupied Haiti: Being the Report of a Committee of Six Disinterested Americans Representing Organizations Exclusively American, Who, Having Personally Studied Conditions in Haiti in 1926, Favor the Restoration of the Independence of the Negro Republic*. New York, N.Y.: Writers Pub. Co, 1927.

"Basis Of Hayti Charges Told." *The Washington Herald*, October 28, 1920. Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers. Library of Congress. <https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn83045433/1920-10-28/ed-1/seq-5/>

Bausman, Frederick, Alfred Bettman, William Brynes, Charles C. Burlingham, Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Michael Francis Doyle, Walter L. Flory, et al. *The Seizure of Haiti by the United States: A Report on the Military Occupation of the Republic of Haiti and the History of the Treaty Forced Upon Her*. New York: The Foreign Policy Association, 1922.

Beach, Harlan P. *Renaissant Latin America: An Outline and Interpretation of the Congress on Christian Work in Latin America, Held at Panama, February 10-19, 1916*. New York: Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1916.

Bird, M.B. *The Black Man; or, Haytian Independence*. New York: The American News Line Company, 1869.

"Bishop Hurst Calls For Haitian Inquiry." *New York Times (1857-1922)*, Nov 10, 1920. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/97987638?accountid=14604.

Booker T, Washington, Geraldine McTigue, and Nan E Wooff. *Booker T. Washington Papers Volume 10: 1909-11*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1981.

Brown, William Wells. *The Black Man: His Antecedents, His Genius, and His Achievements*. New York: Thomas Hamilton, 1863.

"Committee of Safety In Haiti To Disarm City." *The Christian Science Monitor (1908-Current File)*, Jul 30, 1915. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/509389075?accountid=14604.

"Court-Martial Now For Haiti's Civilians." *New York Times (1857-1922)*, Jun 14, 1921. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/98432593?accountid=14604.

Daniels, Josephus. *The Wilson Era: Years of Peace, 1910-1917*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1944.

"Daniels Orders Complete Probe of Marine Acts On Haiti Isle." *Arizona Republican (1890 - 1922)*, Oct 16, 1920. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/814556594?accountid=14604.

"Debate On Haiti Rouses Women's Club." *New York Times (1923-Current File)*, Feb 21, 1930. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/99042489?accountid=14604.

Denny, Harold N. "Proud Haiti Demands Her Old Freedom." *New York Times (1923-Current File)*, Oct 09, 1932. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/100480300?accountid=14604.

"Departure of the Rev. L. Ton Evans. Farewell Gathering at Mount Pleasant Chapel, Cadoxton. Several Presentations to the Rev. Gentleman". *Barry Docks News*, March 7, 1902. Accessed November 9, 2018. http://newspapers.library.wales/view/4608029/4608034/36/LIVERPOOL.

Dessalines, Jean-Jacques. "Dessalines' Proclamation, 28 April 1804." in *The Haitian Revolution: A Documentary History*, edited by David Geggus, 180-182. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2014.

Dorce, George S. "Haytien Letter." *The Christian Recorder*, September 5, 1901. Accessed November 27, 2018, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.

Douglass, Frederick. *A Black Diplomat in Haiti: The Diplomatic Correspondence of U.S. Minister Frederick Douglass from Haiti, 1889-1891, Volume II*. Salisbury: Documentary Publications, 1977.

Du Bois, W.E. Burghardt. "Hayti." *The Crisis*, Vol. 10, No. 5 (September 1915): 232.

Du Bois, W. E. Burghardt. "More Light on the Haitian Situation." *The Crisis,* Vol. 25, No. 1 (November 1922): 39.

Edwards, Bryan. *An Historical Survey of the French Colony in the Island of St. Domingo: Comprehending a Short Account of its Ancient Government, Political State, Population, Productions, and Exports; A Narrative of the Calamaties Which Have Desolated the Country Ever Since the Year 1789, with Some Reflections on Their Causes and Probable Consequences; and a Detail of the Military Transactions of the British Army in That Island to the End of 1794*. London: J. Stockdale, 1797.

Everhard. Philip. *History of the American Baptist African and Haytien Missions: For the Use of Sabbath Schools*. Boston: Massachusetts Sabbath School Union, 1831.

"Farewell Meeting and Presentation at Tonyrefail." *Barry Docks News*, March 7, 1902. Accessed November 9, 2018. http://newspapers.library.wales/view/4608029/4608034/36/LIVERPOOL.

General Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. *Journal of the Twenty-Sixth Quadrennial Session of the General Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church Held in St. Louis, Missouri, May 3rd to 18th, 1920*. Nashville: A.M.E. Sunday School Union, 1922.

"Haiti Cruelty Charge Denied." *Courier-Journal (1869-1922)*, Dec 04, 1920. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/1023740990?accountid=14604.

"Haiti's Protest." *The West Virginian*, August 11, 1915, Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers. Library of Congress. <https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn86072054/1915-08-11/ed-1/seq-4/>.

Holly, A. P. "Haiti Captured By United States Government." *The Chicago Defender*, October 30, 1915. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/493276723?accountid=14604.

Holly, James Theodore. "A Vindication of the Capacity of the Negro Race for Self-Government and Civilized Progress." In *Black Separatism and the Caribbean 1860*, edited by Howard H. Bell, 17-66. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1970.

Holly, James Theodore. *Facts About the Church Mission in Haiti: A Concise Statement by Bishop Holly*. New York: Thomas Whitaker 2&3 Bible House, 1897.

"Hoover Aims To End Our Stay In Haiti." *New York Times (1923-Current File)*, Feb 05, 1930.

https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/99054857?accountid=14604.

Inman, Samuel Guy. *Through Santo Domingo and Haiti: A Cruise With the Marines*. New York: Committee on Co-operation in Latin America, 1919.

Jefferson, Thomas, "To French Representative Pichon, 31 October 1801." In *The Haitian Revolution: A Documentary History*, edited by David Geggus, 195-197. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2014.

Johnson, Henry Theodore. "Cuba Retrograding." *The Christian Recorder*, August 7, 1902. https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.

Johnson, Henry Theodore. "Self-Bleeding Haiti." *The Christian Recorder*, September 18, 1902. https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.

Johnson, James Weldon. *Self-Determining Haiti: Four Articles Reprinted from "The Nation" Embodying a Report of an Investigation Made for The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People*. Forgotten Books, 2015.

Jordan, L. G. *Up the Ladder in Foreign Mission*. Nashville: National Baptist Publishing Board, 1903.

Kealing, H.T. "Only Four in the World." *The A.M.E. Church Review*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (1907).

"Killing of 3,250 Natives in Hayti Ignored by the U.S.; Reports Are Suppressed." *The New York* Herald, October 25, 1920. Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers. Library of Congress. <https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn83045774/1920-10-25/ed-1/seq-1/>.

King, Judson. "U.S. Marines Revive Slavery In Haiti." *The Chicago Defender (National Edition) (1921-1967)*, Jun 10, 1922. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/491920412?accountid=14604.

Link, Arthur S., David W. Hirst, John E. Little, Edith James, Sylvia Elvin, and Phyllis Marchand, eds. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson: Volume 27, 30, 31*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Link, Arthur S. David W. Hirst, John E. Little, Ann Dexter Gordon, Phyllis Marchand, and Margaret D. Link, eds. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson: Volume 32-34*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Lord, S. E. Churchstone. “Congratulating Du Bois on his 50th Birthday.” *W. E. B. Du Bois Papers* (MS 312) Special Collections and University Libraries, University of Massachusetts Amherst Libraries. http://credo.library.umass.edu/view/full/mums312-b012-i087.

Lord, S. E. Churchstone. "U.S. Marines Should Get Out Of Haitian Republic." *The Chicago Defender (National Edition) (1921-1967)*, Jun 4, 1921. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/491905987?accountid=14604.

MacCorkle, William Alexander. *The Monroe Doctrine in Its Relation to the Republic of Haiti*. New York: The Neale Publishing Company, 1915.

"Marines As Missionaries." *Courier-Journal (1869-1922)*, Jun 15, 1919. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/1038651656?accountid=14604.

"Navy Court Clears Marines In Haiti." *New York Times (1857-1922)*, Dec 19, 1920. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/98041735?accountid=14604.

Payne, Daniel A. *History of the African Methodist Episcopal Church*. 1891, reprinted. New York: Arno Press and The New York Times, 1969.

Ransom, Reverdy C. “American Intervention in Haiti.” *The A.M.E. Church Review*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (1915).

"Reports Unlawful Killing of Haitians By Our Marines." *New York Times (1857-1922)*, Oct 14, 1920. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/97868972?accountid=14604.

"Rev. L Ton Evans." *New York Times (1923-Current File)*, Mar 31, 1933. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/100549614?accountid=14604.

Revels, Rev. W.R. “Eight Reasons for Objecting to the Haytien Scheme.” *The Christian Recorder*, July 5, 1862. Accessed June 14, 2018, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.

"Rushing Marines To Haiti, Hoover To Tell Congress Of Troubles There Today." *New York Times (1923-Current File)*, Dec 07, 1929. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/104824426?accountid=14604.

"Says Haitians Approve Our Action." *New York Times (1857-1922)* October 6, 1920. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/98110047?accountid=14604.

Strother, T. "Opposition to Haytien Emigration." *The Christian Recorder*, November 30, 1861. Accessed June 14, 2018, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.

Streit, Clarence K. "Intervention Irks Proud Haitian Folk." *New York Times (1923-Current File)*, Feb 19, 1928. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/104631374?accountid=14604.

Sumner, Charles. *The Bill to Authorize the Appointment of Diplomatic Representatives to the Republics of Hayti and Liberia*. Washington: The Congressional Globe Office, 1862.

Sumner, Charles. *The Selected Letters of Charles Sumner*, Volume 2: 1859-1874, edited by Beverly Wilson Palmer. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1990.

Sumner, Charles. *Violations of International Law and Usurpations of War Powers*. Washington: F. & J. Rives & Geo. A. Bailey, Reporters and Printers of the Debates of Congress, 1871.

Tanner, Benjamin Tucker. "Annexation of Dominica." *The Christian Recorder*, April 2, 1870. Accessed June 28, 2018, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.

Tanner, Benjamin Tucker. "Hayti and Dominica." *The Christian Recorder*, February 13, 1869. Accessed June 14, 2018. https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.

"The 1805 Constitution of Haiti," transcribed online by Bob Corbett on April 4, 1999, accessed February 27, 2016. faculty.webster.edu/corbetre/haiti/history/earlyhaiti/1805-const.htm.

"Uncle Sam's Marines Are Holding City." *The Daily Ardmoreite*, August 2, 1915, Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers. Library of Congress. <https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85042303/1915-08-02/ed-1/seq-1/>.

United States Congress. Senate. Select Committee on Haiti and Santo Domingo. *Inquiry into Occupation and Administration of Haiti and Santo Domingo: Hearings Before a Select Committee on Haiti and Santo Domingo, United States Senate, Sixty-Seventh Congress, First Session, Pursuant to S. RES. 112 Authorizing a Special Committee to*

Inquire Into the Occupation and Administration of the Territories of the Republic of Haiti and the Dominican Republic. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1922.

"U.S. Color Line Unbearable, Says Haiti." *The Chicago Defender (Big Weekend Edition) (1905-1966)*, Dec 11, 1915. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/493302331?accountid=14604.

U.S. Department of State. *Bishop Keruzan to Robert Lansing, September 17, 1918.* by Monseigneur Keruzan. 838.00/1551. Washington, D.C.: 1918.

U.S. Department of State. *Brigade, USMC Port au Prince, Haiti, Letter to Commandant, Marine Corps, March 17, 1919*. by Brigade, USMC Port au Prince, Haiti. 838.00/1565. Washington, D.C.: 1919.

U.S. Department of State. *Change of Commander of Operation in Haiti*. by Ferdinand Mayer. 838.00/1544. Washington, D.C.: August 20, 1918.

U.S. Department of State. *Charge Davis to the Secretary of State, American Legation, Port-au-Prince, September 21, 1915*. by R.B. Davis. Washington, D.C.: Foreign Relations of the United States, 1915. http://images.library.wisc.edu/FRUS/EFacs/1915/reference/frus.frus1915.i0022.

U.S. Department of State. *Conditions in Haiti, September 17, 1918*. by Jordan Herbert Stabler. 838.00/1550. Washington, D.C.: 1918.

U.S. Department of State. *Letter from Evans to Wilson, November 18, 1918*. by L. Ton Evans. 838.00/1549. Washington, D.C.: 1918.

U.S. Department of State. *Letter from Lansing to Tumulty, November 4, 1918*. by Robert Lansing. 838.00/1547. Washington, D.C.: 1918.

U.S. Department of State. *Letter from Moore to Evans, August 2, 1918*. by A.M. Moore. 838.00/1553. Washington, D.C.: 1918.

U.S. Department of State. *Memorandum*. by Arthur Bailly-Blanchard. 838.00/1547. Washington, D.C.: 1918.

U.S Department of State. *Memorandum to the Honorable Woodrow Wilson, President of The United States: Present Situation in Haiti, showing some of the Causes of Discontent*. by L. Ton Evans. 838.00/1547. Washington, D.C.: 1918.

U.S. Department of State. *Mr. Fish to Mr. Bassett*. by Hamilton Fish. U.S. Department of State: Washington, D.C.: Foreign Relations of the United States, 1871.

http://images.library.wisc.edu/FRUS/EFacs2/1871-72/reference/frus.frus187172.i0031.pdf

U.S. Department of State. *Waldron Letter to President Wilson, November 6. 1918*. by Waldron J. Milton. 838.00/1548. Washington, D.C.: 1918)

"U. S. Troops Attack Haitian Girls." *The Chicago Defender (Big Weekend Edition) (1905-1966)*, May 15, 1920. https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/493373826?accountid=14604.

Weaver, Elisha. "Anti-Haytien Immigration Meeting." *The Christian Recorder*, May 25, 1861. Accessed June 14, 2018, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.

Weaver, Elisha. "Spain and San Domingo. – Much Excitement Prevailed in Havana." *The Christian Recorder*, April 6, 1861. Accessed June 14, 2018, https://www.accessible.com/accessible/brand?MpThe+Christian+Recorder=on.

Secondary Sources

Alexis, Yveline. "Remembering Charlemagne Peralte and his Defense of Haiti's Revolution", in *The Idea of Haiti: Rethinking Crisis and Development*, edited by Millery Polyne, 51-66. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013.

Bellegarde-Smith, Patrick, Alex Dupuy, Robert Fatton Jr., Mary Renda, Ermitte St. Jacques and Jeffrey Sommers. "Haiti and Its Occupation by the United States in 1915: Antecedents and Outcomes." *Journal of Haitian Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 2, Special Issue on the US Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934 (Fall 2015): pp. 10-43.

Brown, Stewart J. *Providence and Empire, 1815-1914*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2008.

Byrd, Brandon R. "To Start Something to Help These People: African American Women and the Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934." *Journal of Haitian Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 2, Special Issue on the US Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934 (Fall 2015): pp. 154-180.

Calder, Bruce J. *The Impact of Intervention: The Dominican Republic During the U.S. Occupation of 1916-1924*. Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1984.

Callcott, Wilfred Hardy. *The Caribbean Policy of the United States, 1890-1920*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1942.

Carey, Hilary M. *God's Empire: Religion and Colonialism in the British World, c. 1801-1908*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Clark, George P. "The Role of the Haitian Volunteers at Savannah in 1779: An Attempt at an Objective View." *Phylon (1960-)* 41, no. 4 (1980): 356-366.

Clavin, Matthew J. *Toussaint Louverture and the American Civil War: The Promise and Peril of a Second Haitian Revolution*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

Cooper, Jr., John Milton. *The Warrior and the Priest: Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 1983.

Cortada, James N. and James W. Cortada. *U.S. Foreign Policy in the Caribbean, Cuba, and Central America*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1985.

Curtis, Sarah A. *Civilizing Habits: Women Missionaries and the Revival of French Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Dash, Michael J. *Haiti and the United States: National Stereotypes and the Literary Imagination*. Second Edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998.

Davis, David Brion. *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Delisle, Philippe. "Bretons in Conquest of a Former Colony: French Catholic Missionaries in Haiti, 1860-1915", in *In God's Empire: French Missionaries and the Modern World*, edited by Owen White and J.P. Daughton, 68-82. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Dozier, Craig L. *Nicaragua's Mosquito Shore: The Years of British and American Presence*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1985.

Dubois, Laurent. *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press, 2004.

Dubois, Laurent. *Haiti: The Aftershocks of History*. New York: Picador, 2012.

Fatton Jr., Robert. *The Roots of Haitian Despotism*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2007.

Gaffield, Julia. *Haitian Connections in the Atlantic World: Recognition After Revolution*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2015.

Geggus, David. *The Haitian Revolution: A Documentary History*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2014.

Gilderhus, Mark T. *The Second Century: U.S.-Latin American Relations Since 1889*. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 2000.

Girard, Philippe R. *The Slaves Who Defeated NapoleonL Toussaint Louverture and the Haitian War of Independence, 1801-1804.*

Girard, Philippe. *Haiti: The Tumultuous History – From Pearl of the Caribbean to Broken Nation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Girard, Philippe. *Toussaint Louverture: A Revolutionary Life*. New York: Basic Books, 2016.

Gobat, Michel. *Confronting the American Dream: Nicaragua Under U.S. Imperial Rule*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005.

Griffiths, Leslie. *History of Methodism in Haiti*. Port-au-Prince: Impremerie Me'thodiste, 1991.

Hale, Charles R. *Resistance and Contradiction: Miskitu Indians and the Nicaraguan State, 1894-1987*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.

Hansen, Holger Bernt & Michael Twaddle. *Christian Missionaries & The State in the Third World*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2002.

Hartlyn, Jonathan. "The Dominican Republic: The Legacy of Intermittent Engagement." In *Exporting Democracy: The United States and Latin America: Case Studies*, edited by Abraham F. Lowenthal. 53-92. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.

Healy, David. *Drive to Hegemony: The United States in the Caribbean, 1898-1917*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.

Heinl, Jr., Robert Debs and Nancy Gordon Heinl. *Written in Blood: The Story of the Haitian People, 1492-1971*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978.

Heneise, Ivah Todd. *Pioneers of Light: Stories of the Baptist Witness in Haiti, 1823-1998*. Penney Farms: International Christian Education Fund, 1999.

Hollinger, David A. *Protestants Abroad: How Missionaries Tried to Change the World but Changed America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017.

"History." LottCarey.org. http://lottcarey.org/about-us/history/ (accessed December 14, 2018).

Hunt, Alfred N. *Haiti's Influence on Antebellum America: Slumbering Volcano in the Caribbean*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988.

Jackson, Maurice and Jacqueline Bacon. “Fever and Fret: The Haitian Revolution and African American Responses”, in *African Americans and the Haitian Revolution: Selected Essays and Historical Documents*, edited by Maurice Jackson and Jacqueline Bacon. 9-23. New York: Routledge, 2010.

James, C.L.R. *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L’Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*. Second Edition Revised. New York: Vintage Books, 1963.

Jenson, Deborah. *Beyond the Slave Narrative: Politics, Sex, and Manuscripts in the Haitian Revolution*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011.

Johnson, Ronald Angelo. *Diplomacy in Black and White: John Adams, Toussaint Louverture, and Their Atlantic World Alliance*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2014.

Lachance, Paul. “Repercussions of the Haitian Revolution in Louisiana.” In *The Impact of the Haitian Revolution on the Atlantic World*, edited by David Patrick Geggus. 209-230. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001.

Langley, Lester D. *The Americas in the Age of Revolution: 1750-1850*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

Langley, Lester D. *The United States and the Caribbean in the Twentieth Century*. Fourth Edition. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989.

Link, Arthur S. *Wilson: The New Freedom*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956.

Link, Arthur S. *Wilson: The Struggle for Neutrality, 1914-1915*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960.

Link, Arthur S. *Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era, 1910-1917*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1954.

Lockett, James D. “Abraham Lincoln and Colonization: An Episode That Ends in Tragedy at L’Ile de Vache, Haiti, 1863-1864,” *Journal of Black Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 4, (June, 1991): 428-444.

Lowenthal, Abraham F., ed. *Exporting Democracy: The United States and Latin America: Case Studies*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.

"MILESTONES 1914-1920 – The U.S. Invasion and Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934." U.S. Department of State Office of the Historian. Accessed March 25, 2016. https://history.state.gov/milestones/1914-1920/haiti.

Newman, Simon P. “American Political Culture and the French and Haitian Revolutions: Nathaniel Cutting and the Jeffersonian Republicans”, in *The Impact of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World*, edited by David P. Geggus. 72-89. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001.

Nicholls, David. *From Dessalines to Duvalier: Race, Colour, and National Independence in Haiti*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1996.

Notter, Harley A. *The Origins of the Foreign Policy of Woodrow Wilson*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937.

O’Brien, Thomas. *The Century of U.S. Capitalism in Latin America*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1999.

O’Brien, Thomas. *The Revolutionary Mission: American Enterprise in Latin America, 1900-1945*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Olsen, Scott H. “Reverend L. Ton Evans and the United States Occupation of Haiti.” *Caribbean Studies*, Vol. 26, No. ½ (1993): 23-48.

Pamphile, Leon D. *Contrary Destinies: A Century of America’s Occupation, Deoccupation, and Reoccupation of Haiti*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2015.

Pamphile, Leon D. *Haitians and African Americans: A Heritage of Tragedy and Hope*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001.

Plummer, Brenda Gayle. “The Afro-American Response to the Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934”. *Phylon*, Vol. 43, No. 2 (2nd Quarter, 1982): 125-143.

Plummer, Brenda Gayle. *Haiti and the Great Powers, 1902-1915*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988.

Plummer, Brenda Gayle. *Haiti and the United States: The Psychological Moment*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1992.

Polyne, Millery. *From Douglass to Duvalier: U.S. African Americans, Haiti, and Pan Americanism, 1870-1964*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2010.

Renda, Mary. *Taking Haiti: Military Occupation & the Culture of U.S. Imperialism, 1915-1940*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Roberts, Shearon. “Then and Now: Haitian Journalism as Resistance to US Occupation and US-Led Reconstruction.” *Journal of Haitian Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 2, Special Issue on the US Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934 (Fall 2015): pp. 241-268.

Rooy, Syndey H. “Inman, Samuel Guy.” *Biographical Dictionary of Christian Missions*, edited by Gerald H. Anderson, 319. New York: Macmillan Reference USA, 1998.

Rugemer, Edward Bartlett. *The Problem of Emancipation: The Caribbean Roots of the American Civil War*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 2009.

Schmidt, Hans. *The United States Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934*. 2nd Printing. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1995.

Schoultz, Lars. *Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy Toward Latin America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Sommers, Jeffrey. *Race, Reality, and Realpolitik: U.S.-Haiti Relations in the Lead Up to the 1915 Occupation*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2015.

Stanford University. “Timeline: Nicaragua”. Stanford.edu. https://web.stanford.edu/group/arts/nicaragua/discovery_eng/timeline/ (accessed January 21, 2019).

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1995.

Tyrrell, Ian. *Reforming the World: The Creation of America’s Moral Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Verna, Chantalle F. *Haiti and the Uses of America: Post-U.S. Occupation Promises*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2017.

White, Ashli. “The Saint-Dominguan Refugees and American Distinctiveness in the Early Years of the Haitian Revolution”, in *The World of the Haitian Revolution*, edited by David Patrick Geggus and Norman Fiering, 248-260. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009.